



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



US 5458.23



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY



US 5458.23



HARVARD  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY





*Hon. Chas. .  
with the  
of the L*

**ENGLAND,  
THE UNITED STATES,**

AND

**The Southern Confederacy.**

**BY AN AMERICAN.**

LONDON:

**SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47, LUDGATE HILL.**

1863.



AR 346

US 5458.23



ENGLAND,  
THE UNITED STATES,  
AND THE  
SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.

*Fitzwilliam*  
BY F. W. SARGENT, M.D.

"Nothing extenuate,  
Nor set down aught in malice."  
—OTHELLO.

LONDON:  
-SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47, LUDGATE HILL.  
1863.

931428

U.S. 5458.23

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1863, Oct. 15;

Gil: of

Gen. Chas. Sumner,  
(Oct. 5 1860.)

TO MY COUNTRY!

---

"IN FRETÀ DUM FLUVII CURRENT, DUM MONTIBUS UMBRÆ  
LUSTRABUNT CONVEKÀ, POLUS DUM SIDERA PASCET,  
SEMPER HONOR, NOMENQUE TUUM, LAUDESQUE MANEBUNT,  
QUÆ ME CUNQUE VOCANT TERRÆ."

*Æneid*, lib. 1-607

## PREFACE.

---

THE origin of the following pages was a letter written by me to a friend in England. It was suggested to me to publish it, and I consented to do so, enlarging and modifying the original letter. The epistolary style has been preserved for convenience sake.

It may be said that this pamphlet appears "very late in the day." But, since the real questions involved in the American Civil War have become so much masked and perverted, in England, by passions and interests, it may not be amiss to recal attention to the truths and the real issues at stake.

In justice to my subject, I may be permitted to express a regret that the materials for my paper have not been more abundant and weighty than I have been able to procure, in so small a place as Nice. But to those English friends and advocates of the cause of the United States to whose writings and speeches I have been much indebted, I render my most grateful acknowledgments.

No one admires the really great elements of the English character more than I do, or more cheerfully acknowledges the debt which humanity owes to England, for wise lessons taught, and great deeds done. I feel almost a personal interest that English opinion and action should be right, not only with regard to my own country, but in general. And if, in these pages, I have criticised what has seemed the public sentiment of England towards the United States, as being unwise and unjust, I have done so as a friend to England; "Not that I have loved Cæsar less, but that I love Rome more."

F. W. SARGENT, M.D.

NICE, *May*, 28th, 1863.

#### ERRATA.

On page 1, last line but one, for *the* household-gods of the Greek, read *his* household-gods to the Greek.

„ page 10, line 9 from bottom.—For *both*, read *all*.

„ page 29, line 9.—For *philanthrophy*, read *philanthropy*.

„ page 35, line 32.—For 3,200,304, read 3,200,000.

„ page 69, line 24.—For *grande*, read *grand*.

„ page 79, line 24.—For *United*, read *Northern*.

„ page 94, lines 23 and 24.—For *Stilli*, read *Stillé*.

# ENGLAND, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.

---

THE Civil War in America is regarded by Englishmen and by loyal Americans from very different points of view.

In *England* some consider it simply as a question of philanthropy ; and these think only of the immense evils which must flow from such a contest. Others see only the great disturbance it occasions to British interests ; while a third, and most influential class, concerns itself with neither of these two effects, but is chiefly busied in determining how far the war may be made to benefit Great Britain, and injure the United States. The first two classes pray that the war may speedily end, on no matter what basis, in order that its terrible mischiefs may cease. The third class equally desires the prompt termination of the strife, in order that the hoped-for dismemberment of the Union, and the beneficial results to England expected therefrom, may not be endangered by the prolongation of the struggle.

I should be unwilling to intimate that any number of Englishmen could be found to indulge such a hope, from motives so selfish ; but it has been proclaimed by the British Press very unanimously, and by Lords and Commons, that "it is for the interest of England that the American bubble should burst, and the Great Republic go to pieces."

To us, on the other hand, the war and its results involve interests far above and beyond those of individuals, considered as such, however great may be their sufferings and trials, or of commerce and industry. Our national existence and the very principles of our form of government are at stake. Unimportant or worthless as these may seem in England, to us they are like the household-gods of the Greek.

Whether with reason or not, we are proud of our country and her institutions ; and while most of us admit that the latter are by no means perfect, they have, nevertheless, secured to us an unexampled degree of prosperity. We are taunted in England with considering *extent of national domain* as synonymous with *national greatness*. Americans are not so ignorant. See what our institutions have accomplished, beyond mere material development, in less than a century. Under their influence our population has increased from three millions to thirty millions. They have covered the land, that part of it, at least, where they have had full sway, with schools so numerous, that England is put to shame ; with churches providing an aggregate accommodation greater, comparatively, than the City of London ; with benevolent establishments of all sorts, so liberally administered, that England has done us the honour to admire them. Under their auspices the sciences, literature, the æsthetic and mechanical arts have been so well cultivated, that, all things considered, America will bear a favourable comparison with any other country.

Nor is it Americans alone who have benefited by the institutions of America. She has fed the hungry, she has sheltered the stranger, she has clothed the naked, and ministered to the desolate of every nation. Millions of British subjects who have been thrown off from their own country, as though they had been unclean things, have come to America, and America has received them as her own children ; she has taken out-cast humanity "by the four corners," as in the strange vision of the Apostle, and welcomed it to recognition. And wheresoever, in all the world, money and self-devotion are needed for benevolent and religious operations, America contributes her full share, and Americans are there to aid the good work.

For all these things, I say, we are proud of our country and our political institutions, and we think them worth fighting for.

In order that the true principles and obligations involved in the American war may be clearly understood, I propose, in the following pages, to examine into—

1. The History of Slavery in America, the condition into which it has brought the Slave States, and its contemplated career ;
2. The Causes of the Rebellion ;
3. The Duties which the Federal Constitution has imposed upon the Federal Government, in relation to the Rebellion ;
4. The Policy and Position of the Federal Government and the People of the Free States, with reference to Slavery and the Negroes ; and the Objects of the War ;
5. The Attitude of England, her Duties and her Interests.

In all that I shall have to say of the Slave States, I shall endeavour, so far as possible, to make use of facts, arguments, and opinions which have been furnished by the Southerners themselves.

## SLAVERY IN AMERICA—ITS EARLY HISTORY.

The first negroes imported into the English colonies in America were brought from the coast of Africa in a Dutch ship, and landed on the banks of the James River, in the colony of Virginia; they were *twenty* in number, and were purchased by the planters for the cultivation of their tobacco-fields. This event occurred in 1620, only thirteen years after the colony was definitively established, and it is worthy of remark that, *in this same memorable year, the Pilgrim Fathers of New England landed on Massachusetts Bay.* We may say of this notable coincidence, as Louis XVIII. said to some one who reminded him that the Duke of Wellington was born the same year as Napoleon, "*Providence owed us such a compensation.*"

The odious distinction of having first interested England in the slave-trade belongs to Sir John Hawkins. He had fraudulently transported a large cargo of Africans to Hispaniola, in 1562. The rich returns of sugar, ginger, and pearls, attracted the notice of Queen Elizabeth, and when a new expedition was prepared, she was induced not only to protect, but to share, the traffic. And, nearly a century later, in 1645, a ship of one Thomas Keyser and one James Smith, the latter a member of the Church of Boston, first brought upon the English colonists the guilt of direct participation in the traffic in African slaves. They sailed for Guinea to trade in negroes; but throughout Massachusetts the cry of justice was raised against them as malefactors and murderers. Richard Saltonstall felt himself moved by his duty as a magistrate, to denounce the act of stealing negroes as "expressly contrary to the word of God and the law of the country;" the guilty men were committed for the offence; and, after advice with the elders, the representatives of the people, bearing "witness against the heinous crime of man-stealing," ordered the negroes to be restored, at the public charge, "to their native country, with a letter expressing the indignation of the general court" at their wrongs.—(See Bancroft's "History of the United States.")

This new element of labour was introduced into the *Carolina* colonies, when they were founded at a later period, somewhere about 1670. In the colony of *Georgia*, according to the original charter granted in 1732 by George II., negro slavery was expressly prohibited, in consequence of the bad effects it had already produced in Virginia and the Carolinas, and because this new colony was intended to be settled by poor but deserving people, for the purpose of benefiting them; and it was understood that in such a colony, to



ensure success, labour must be held in respect, not degraded by being a badge of slavery. But the evil example of the neighbouring colony of South Carolina infected the *English* settlers in Georgia, who began to clamour for the introduction of negroes. The *Scotch* and *German* colonists, however, without exception, remonstrated against this measure. For twenty years the trustees were worried with demands and remonstrances. The line of argument and of conduct was then pretty much what it has since been: the pro-slavery English colonists contended that the "British Constitution, zealous for the rights and liberties of mankind, could not permit subjects to be deprived of the common privileges of all colonists; that the chief cause of all their troubles was the strict adherence to a chimerical and impracticable scheme" (of dispensing with slavery). "The leading men in the Scotch and German settlements, who opposed the introduction of slaves, were traduced and persecuted; the churches were induced to represent it as desirable that Africans should be imported, that they might be converted to Christianity; the Clergy were flattered into preaching and praying for an institution sanctioned by the Bible. The standing toast at Savannah was, '*The one thing needful*,' meaning slavery." At last the trustees, wearied out, yielded up their charter to the King, who immediately removed all impediments to the introduction of slavery. —(Olmsted's "Seaboard Slave States," 527-8.)

But, besides the negro slaves, there were in the colony of Virginia other persons held to slavery—

1. *Christian bond servants*, "Redemptioners," as they were called. These were white persons who were brought over from Europe to labour in the colony. They were bound to repay, "by the entire employment of their powers for the benefit of their masters," the cost of their importation and support. They received no wages, but were maintained by their masters, until their term of service had expired, when, on application to the governor, they might become free men of the province.

2. *English criminals and other offenders*, who were, from time to time, given to the courtiers by the King, and by them sold to the colonists as *slaves*, to the annual number, just before the American Revolution, of *three hundred or more*. The same class existed also in the colony of Maryland. The first introduction of such persons into the colony of Virginia occurred in 1619, in consequence of a petition from the colonists to the King, that he would make them a present of "vagabonds and condemned men." His Majesty "*was graciously pleased*" to grant this request, and a hundred head of the inmates of the London prisons were shipped to Virginia. Charles II. ordered a *shipment* of *Quakers* to Virginia, where they were sold as slaves. In 1720, Beverley, the annalist of Virginia, says—"As for malefactors condemned to transportation, though

the greedy planter will always buy them, yet, it is to be feared, they will be very injurious to the country, which has always suffered many murders and robberies." And earlier than this, so bad had the reputation of the colony become in London, amongst the class of persons usually sold into this kind of bondage, that Smith wrote, "Some did choose to be hanged ere they would go thither, *and were.*"

It is stated, in Colton's "Progress of the United States," that, about the year 1619, amongst a lot of 1,200 freshly-arrived emigrants, "were one hundred and fifty young women, who were *sold to the planters for wives.*" Thus, early in the history of the colony, did the purity of blood of the Virginians begin to be defiled; and any one who will read the annals of this, the most *aristocratic* of the American colonies, will find that fresh impurities were constantly thrown into the stream. So that, although there was originally what might be called "aristocratic" blood in the colonists, and still may be, perhaps, yet it would be difficult to say, now, what is pure and what plebeian,—unless, indeed, we incline to the liberal notion that a fraction of a drop of the original *sanguis azul*, infinitissimally diluted, has virtue enough to ennoble the whole race of Virginians for ever.

3. *Coloured slaves*, not only negroes from Africa, but *Indians*, who (although one of the avowed objects of the colonization of Virginia, as also of the other colonies, was the Christianizing of the aborigines) were yet subjected to slavery, on the plea that they were captives taken in war. And the same was done with captive Indians in the other Southern colonies.

In 1662, forty years after the first introduction of negroes, there had come to be so many mulatto children in the colony, as to excite the cupidity of the planters; and a law was enacted, in direct contravention of the supreme English law, directing that the children of slaves should follow the condition of their mother and not of the father. And, that there should be no scruple as to the right to hold *Christians as slaves*, (and that the obligation imposed by the Church to baptize all children should be complied with,) another law was passed in 1669, that the Christian offspring of all slaves might be held as property by the owners of the mothers thereof. Subsequently, also, laws were passed to discourage emancipation, taxing free negro women, in contradistinction to other females who were exempt from personal taxation.—(See, on this subject of the early history of the colonies, Mr. Olmsted's "Seaboard Slave States.")

Thus early was slavery introduced into the British colonies in America. Slavery of *white persons* must have been abolished at the time of the Revolution, if not before. But in the year 1790, when the first census of the United States was taken, there were 697,897 slaves and 59,466 free blacks.

## EARLY EFFORTS MADE TO ABOLISH SLAVERY.

But the public sentiment against slavery, especially in Virginia, had become quite strong even during colonial days, and most prominent men were anxious to secure its early abolition. Thus in 1774, in a convention held in Virginia, Mr. Jefferson stated, "The abolition of domestic slavery is the greatest object of desire in these colonies, where it was, unhappily, introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves, it is necessary to exclude further importations from Africa; yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, and by imposing duties which might amount to prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by His Majesty's negative." Patrick Henry said, "It would rejoice my very soul that every one of my fellow-beings was emancipated." Washington, in a letter dated 1786, said it was among "his first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery, in this country, may be abolished by law;" and in his will he expressed the desire that, on the death of Mrs. Washington, his slaves should be freed, which wish Mrs. Washington complied with immediately, without waiting until her own decease. It was considered *monstrous*, by most slaveholders, in the early days of our country, "to admit into the Constitution the idea that there could be *property in men*."—"Madison.") And when the Constitution was submitted to the people of the different States to be discussed in their conventions, many persons advocated the abolition of slavery. Apart from the general inhumanity of the system, and the contradiction which it was felt to impose on the very spirit of the Constitution, it was opposed on the ground of *expediency and morality*. In his notes on Virginia, written in 1781, and published for the first time in Paris, in 1784, (see "Thomas Jefferson, Etude Historique," &c., Par De Witt. Paris, p. 129,) Mr. Jefferson said, "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions—the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. With the morals of the people, their industry is also destroyed; for in a warm climate, no man will labour for himself who can make another labour for him. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God—that they are not to be violated but by His wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep for ever; that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune,

an exchange of situation, is among possible events ; that it may become probable by supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest " (a slave insurrection). In the chapter from which the above extracts are taken, he speaks of slaves as "*citizens* ;" in another chapter he says, " We must wait with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these our *brethren*." In the Virginia Convention, on the consideration of the adoption of the Constitution, and especially on that article prohibiting the importation of slaves, Mr. Mason, of Virginia, an ancestor of the present Confederate Commissioner in London, argued, " Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labour when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. They produce the most pernicious effects on manners." Accordingly, he and others amongst the Virginians advocated the passage of that clause which prohibited the slave-trade, and it was unanimously adopted, and this traffic was forbidden after December 1st, 1774. But subsequently, when the new Federal Constitution was accepted, in 1787, the period of this prohibition was protracted until 1808, in concession to the demands of the more Southern Slave States.

However, Virginia abolished the slave-trade, so far as her own citizens were concerned, in 1776. North Carolina had done so in 1774. In 1780, emancipation measures were passed by Massachusetts and Pennsylvania ; by Rhode Island, in 1784 ; by New Hampshire, in 1792 ; by New Jersey, in 1794 ; by Vermont, previous to her admission, in 1791. South Carolina passed a law abolishing the slave-trade, for her own citizens, for the space of one year, and this law was annually renewed until 1804, when the demand for slaves to produce cotton became much increased, and the trade was left untrammelled until 1808.\*

\* The author of a pamphlet, entitled "*La Révolution Américaine dévoilée. Paris, 1861*," says, that during the four years intervening between 1804-8, there were imported into Charleston alone 39,075 slaves from Africa. Of these, 35,532 were introduced by Americans of the Northern States, Englishmen, and Frenchmen, and 3,453 by Southerners. The consignees were—natives of Charleston 13, Northern people 88, English 91, French 10, in all, 202. And he points with a certain triumph to these figures, as showing that the South was vastly less tolerant of, or devoted to, the slave-trade than these other parties to it. But the figures prove precisely the reverse of this : there was, of the whole numbers of consignees, *rather less than 1-16th who were natives of Charleston*, and of the total number of importers *almost 1-10th were Southerners*. But the whole tonnage of the South was "but a drop in the bucket," as compared with the aggregate tonnage of the other nations, Northerners, English, and French ; and the population of Charleston was next to nothing as contrasted with that of those other co-workers with Charleston. The due proportion of Charleston, or of the whole South, in this traffic, on either of these bases, would have been but a very small fraction of a slave.

In 1784, Virginia and some other States having ceded to the whole country certain extensive domains lying to the west and north of the Ohio, Mr. Jefferson proposed in Congress that slavery and involuntary servitude, excepting as punishment for crime, should be for ever forbidden in that territory. This Bill was lost through the absence of one of the delegates of New Jersey. In the following year a similar proposition was again rejected. But in 1787 a Bill was passed and approved of by Washington, by virtue of which slavery was for ever forbidden in that portion of the said territory lying to the north-west of the Ohio; and a clause was introduced into the new Federal Constitution, which provided for the return to his master of "any person held to service or labour in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another." Thus the first "*Fugitive Slave Law*" was introduced into the Federal Constitution, and the measures passed in 1850, constituting the more celebrated "*Fugitive Slave Law*," were intended to furnish the means of executing this original provision. And it is worthy of remark here, that, from this very clause, the *original* word "*servitude*" was, "on motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, struck out, and '*service*' unanimously inserted,—the former being thought to express the condition of *slaves*, and the latter the obligations of *free* persons."—("Madison Papers," vol. iii., p. 1,569.) Thus a fresh evidence was bequeathed to posterity by those framers of the Constitution, that they intended the Constitution to be an instrument of perpetuating freedom—a *magna charta* which should secure personal liberty to all, of whatever class or colour, who should come under its provisions. Thus, too, (unhappily, as we now see,) "*compromise*" began at the very outset of our national career, (as of the career of all nations, in fact,) in a spirit of concession to the South, to appease then, as more recently, its threats of separation. And a similar spirit of concession was shown on the part of the North, and also on the part of the Washingtons, Jeffersons, Randolphs, anti-slavery Southern men, with regard to the assessment of direct taxes; the pro-slavery party of the South refusing to allow their slaves to be considered as citizens subject to taxation, regarding them merely as property; and to obviate this difficulty, it was agreed to allow the *vote enumeration* of the South, and the *tax assessment* of the Government, to repose on the same basis, viz., three-fifths of the slave population as well as the white population of the Slave States. But, before criticizing too harshly this yielding on the part of the North, it must be borne in mind, that it was almost universally admitted by South as well as North that slavery was but a *temporary* evil, which was destined to a speedy extinction. The importance of *harmony and union* was by all regarded as more pressing and immediate than the *abolition of slavery*; the former would be, it was contended, a *permanent* advan-

tage, the latter was a foregone conclusion. It was many years afterwards, that the wonderful development of the cotton interest deranged and falsified the apparently just conclusions of the wisest and most patriotic statesmen of both sections of the country.

In his own State of *Virginia*, Mr. Jefferson laboured to accomplish the emancipation of the negroes born after a certain date, but he failed. In *North Carolina*, also, and in *Maryland*, efforts were made in the same direction at about the same early period, 1774-87. In *Georgia*, in some parts of the colony, the people in convention declared their "disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of slavery in America;" and further said, "We therefore resolve, at all times, to use our utmost endeavours for the manumission of our slaves in this colony." Even in *South Carolina* some feeble attempts were made. Thus, in a political pamphlet, published in Charleston in 1784, the writer declared, "Such is the fatal influence of slavery on the human mind, that it almost wholly effaces from it even the boasted characteristic of rationality." And in 1774 it had been, according to Ramsay, the historian, "*Resolved*, That His Majesty's subjects in North America (without respect to colour or other accidents) are entitled to all the inherent rights and liberties of his natural born subjects," &c. What altered ideas with regard to slaves the South has since advocated!

And at a later period, notwithstanding the growing claims of selfish interest, some eloquent voices were still raised in most of these States in favour of the slaves. In 1820, Mr. Reid, of *Georgia*, said in Congress, "I am not the panegyrist of slavery. It is an unnatural state, a dark cloud, which obscures half the lustre of our free institutions." A pamphlet, published under the auspices of the "*Manumission Society of North Carolina*," in 1830, says of slavery, "Even in its mildest form it shrinks from rational inspection—a monster of hideous deformity in its best feature."

A final effort was made in the *Virginia* Legislature to procure the abolition of slavery. One of the numerous advocates of this step, Mr. Faulkner, said, "Slavery, it is admitted, is an evil. It is an institution which presses heavily against the best interests of the State. It banishes free white labour, it exterminates the mechanic, the artizan, the manufacturer. It converts the energy of a community into indolence, its power into imbecility, its efficiency into weakness. Being thus injurious, have we not a right to demand its extermination? Shall society suffer, that the slaveholder may continue to gather his vigintial crop of human flesh? What is his mere pecuniary claim compared to the great interests of the common weal? Must the country languish and die, that the slaveholder may flourish? Shall all interests be subservient to one? Have not the middle classes *their* rights?—rights incompatible with the existence of slavery." In 1848, Mr. Clay endeavoured to have

introduced into the revised Constitution of *Kentucky* a provision for the gradual abolition of slavery; but selfish interest was too strong there also. The great demand for slave labour in the cotton and sugar-producing States had opened a new market for the rearing of slaves for sale in the Northern Slave States, particularly in Virginia; so that, as Mr. Faulkner expressed it, this "*original crop of human flesh*" was found to be more profitable to many planters than the old-fashioned tobacco plantation. And Mr. Clay said, in an address to the *Kentucky* Colonization Society, in 1829, "It is believed that nowhere in the *farming* portion of the United States would slave labour be generally employed, if the proprietor were not tempted to *raise slaves* by the high price of the Southern market, which keeps it up in his own."—(See on this subject of the efforts made to abolish slavery, and the history of public opinion on abolition in the Slave States, the work of Mr. Olmsted, and Helper's "Impending Crisis," chap. iii.)

#### CHANGE OF SENTIMENT AT THE SOUTH.

Since the above period there has been no persistent effort in any of the Slave States to abolish slavery in any way. On the contrary, the whole aim and endeavour have been to establish it more and more firmly, by acquiring for the slavery interest supreme political power in the Federal Government.

And herein consists, it seems to me, the great and inexcusable wrong *against the country and humanity* on the part of the South. Admitting that, as a general rule, the slaves are well cared for *materially*, admitting that they are "*better off*," *materially*, than the labouring population of any other country, even of the Northern States, (which is not true,) still these admissions cannot reconcile a true lover of his country, or of the human race, to *the extension of the system of negro slavery over new territories and over new millions of human beings*. We shall prove from statistics, and from admissions of the warmest advocates of slavery, that the system of African slavery in our country *not only holds out no hope of amelioration to the black race, but almost necessarily condemns the vast majority of the white population of the Slave States to "ignorance, poverty, and crime,"* and to both in an ever-increasing ratio.—(For a careful examination into the question of the comparative well-being of the slaves, and of the labouring population of the Free States of America, see Mr. Olmsted's "Journeys and Explorations in the Cotton Kingdom." London, 1862, vol. ii., chap. 6.)

I do not throw all the blame of this change of sentiment and policy on the South. The Northern people, and Northern politicians, and Europeans also, have derived a larger share, probably, of *the profits* of slavery than the Southerners themselves, even than

the slave-owners. And in the calamity which the American war has brought upon the world, perhaps the just partition of sufferings is being made, proportioned to the emoluments which each nation or section of country has received from that system, the guilt of which is being now expiated, and to the part which each has performed in its extension. Unfortunately, the innocent suffer with the guilty, and sometimes even more than they do.

Formerly, the leading men of the South did not pretend to deny the moral wrong of slavery; that it is opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, and that it injures all parties concerned in it. Their successors now uphold it, as being actually "ordained by God, and promotive of the best interests of society." Indeed, there is a fervid zeal in this modern propagandism. The Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, one of the most distinguished Presbyterian divines of the United States, declared from his pulpit, soon after the war began, "The mission which we have received consists in perpetuating and extending our system of slavery, and in obtaining for it the right to go and take root everywhere that nature and Providence can transport it. We will acquit ourselves of this duty at all hazards. The position of the South, at this moment, is *sublime*. If God gives her grace to understand her mission, she will save herself, in saving America, and the world."—(Laboulaye, "Les Etats-Unis et la France," p. 25.)

Mr. Calhoun said, thirty years ago, "Slavery is the surest and most solid foundation in the world for free institutions." A little later, Governor McDuffie, of South Carolina, said, "Slavery is the very corner-stone of our republican edifice." Governor Hammond, of the same State, unreservedly endorsed the same sentiment, and said still further, "Slavery is not only a necessary and inexorable fact, but it is a moral and humane institution, productive of the greatest political and social advantages."

But the sentiment on the subject of slavery amongst Southerners goes much further than the above, at the present day.

Mr. Fitzhugh, a Virginian, in a book on the *Sociology of the South*, says, "The Jewish Slaves were not negroes, and to *confine* the justification of slavery to the *negro race* would be to weaken the scriptural authority, and to lose the whole weight of profane authority; for we read of no negro slavery in ancient times. *Slavery, black or white, is right and necessary.*" The *Richmond Enquirer*, the ablest and most authoritative of the Southern papers, declares, "Repeatedly have we asked the North,—'Has not the experiment of universal liberty failed? Are not the evils of free society insufferable?' Still no answer. Their universal silence is a conclusive proof, added to many others we have furnished, that *free society*, in the long run, is an *impracticable form of society*: it is everywhere starving, demoralized, and insurrectionary. *Policy*



*and humanity alike forbid the extension of the evils of free society to new people and coming generations.* Until recently the apologists for slavery took half-way grounds. They confined the defence of slavery to *negro slavery*, thereby giving up the slavery *principle*, admitting other forms of slavery to be wrong. The South now maintains that *slavery is right, natural, and necessary.* While it is far more obvious that negroes shall be slaves than whites,—for they are only fit to labour, not to direct,—yet the *principle of slavery is itself right, and does not depend upon difference of complexion.*” Another Virginia paper, the *Southside Democrat*, admits, “We have got to hating everything with the prefix *free*, from free negroes up and down the whole catalogue—free farms, free labour, free society, free will, free thought, and free schools. *But the worst of all these abominations is free schools.*” The article then goes on to discuss the best way of disposing of those poor people who are not able to educate their children, and advises, “Let our legislature pass a law, that whoever will take these parents, and take care of them and their offspring, in health and in sickness, clothe them, feed them, and house them, shall be legally entitled to their services.” —*Daily News*, March 19th, 1863.

Really it is impossible to understand how any Englishman, who boasts of the religion, the morality, the liberty, the civilization of England, as if these were worthy of regard, and striving for, can lend a hand to, or wish for the success of, a community possessing such a creed as the above, to found an independent nationality on. And that it has not been, and is not intended to be, an empty bravado, at least so far as the system of *negro slavery* is concerned, is amply proved by the actual progress made by the slave-power, as we shall presently see, towards the accomplishment of its plans.

#### THE ALLEGED AND REAL MOTIVES FOR THIS REVOLUTION IN SOUTHERN SENTIMENT—SOUTHERN ENCROACHMENTS—RE-ACTION IN THE FREE STATES AGAINST SLAVERY.

Southerners have been in the habit of saying that it was Northern *fanaticism*, on the subject of abolition, which compelled them, in self-defence, to become propagandists of slavery. Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, affirms, “When the abolition agitation began at the North, we were obliged to examine the question of slavery in all its aspects, and, thanks to abolitionism, our conscience has become perfectly at ease on this matter.” But, as we have shown, the desire to abolish slavery was as strong in Virginia as in any other section of the country, for the Northern States, having abolished slavery within their respective limits, were patiently waiting for the South to do likewise. As late as 1830,

of thirty-six abolition societies in the United States, *twenty-eight* were composed of Southern men.—(Ludlow's "History of the United States," p. 166.) And the only newspaper which at that time advocated the abolition of slavery was published in the slave-holding city of Baltimore, by a Quaker named Lundy; the title of the paper was, *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*. Later still, in 1831, Wm. Lloyd Garrison established his journal, *The Liberator*, in Boston, advocating the abolition of slavery, on the broad ground that blacks as well as whites are human beings, and should be treated as such. But at this time abolitionism found no favour in Boston; Garrison was mobbed and imprisoned, but resumed the publication of his journal on his release. Little by little his doctrines gained disciples; abolition societies became multiplied, and an avowed abolition party was formed in Massachusetts, and at length a Representative was elected to Congress, of abolition principles, and finally a senator, Mr. Charles Sumner, was sent to Washington. But the general sentiment of the North was even now opposed to *abolitionism*, as the Southerners use the term. "The American Anti-Slavery Society," organized in 1833 at Philadelphia, expressly affirmed that Congress had not the power to abolish slavery in the States. In 1844, the avowed abolitionist party only polled 66,304 in the whole country in favour of their candidate, Mr. Birney, of Kentucky. In 1848, the *Free-soil* party was not strong enough to give the electoral vote of a single State to its candidate, Martin Van Buren, although there was no pretence put forward by it of a desire to interfere with slavery in the States, because the Constitution authorized the institution there. In 1856, the *Republican party* likewise failed; but in 1860 the same party succeeded in electing Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency. But even this party, so lately triumphant, was not an *abolition* party, their sole aim, so far as slavery was concerned, being that this system should not be *extended*, by Congressional sanction, *into the territories* of the United States, in opposition to the well-known wishes of the vast majority of the people, to the detriment of the nation, and in contravention of the whole spirit and intention of the Constitution, as we have fully shown.—(Ludlow's "History of the United States," p. 166; *Revue des deux Mondes*, Jan., 1861; *Les Etats-Unis en 1863*, par John Bigelow. Paris, 1863.)

The real agitators of the slavery question were the Southerners themselves. Mr. Calhoun, having failed on the *Tariff question*, declared in 1833 that the Slave States could never be united on this, and that the basis of Southern Union must be shifted to the slavery question.—(Benton, quoted in Ludlow's "History of the United States," p. 148.) He established a newspaper in Washington, *The United States Telegraph*, to advocate the special interest of the South. An opportunity for arousing Southern feeling presented

itself on the presentation of a petition from a body of Quakers, praying for [the abolition of slavery and of the slave-trade in *the District of Columbia*, which was placed by the Constitution under the supreme and exclusive control of Congress. Mr. Calhoun opposed the very reception of such petitions, on the "new and extreme ground, entirely contrary to the Constitution itself, and to the whole doctrine of Congress upon it," (as Mr. Benton, a slave-holding Senator from Missouri, remarked,) that Congress had no right to meddle with slavery in the district, but only the people of the district.—("Ludlow," op. cit., p. 165.) Mr. Hill, of New Hampshire, protested in the Senate against the excitement kept up by Mr. Calhoun and his friends, declaring that he abhorred the abolitionists, and that not all their publications combined could do so much mischief as this single journal of Mr. Calhoun's. And ex-President Madison, a slaveholder, writing to Mr. Clay, also a slaveholder, said, "It is painful to see the unceasing efforts made to alarm the South, by imputations against the North of unconstitutional designs on the subject of slavery." And, to another correspondent, he wrote, "The inculcated impression of a permanent incompatibility of interests between the North and the South may put it in the power of popular leaders, aspiring to the highest stations, to unite the South on some critical occasion. In pursuing this course, the first and most obvious step is Nullification, the next Secession, and the last a final Separation.—("Ludlow," p. 164.)

It was high time that the people of the Free States did rouse themselves to the immense progress made by the South towards the complete subversion of the spirit of the Constitution.

In 1803, the Federal Government purchased of France the territory of Louisiana. The purchase was objected to by many persons, but the chief argument in its favour amongst Northern men seems to have been that it gave to the country the command of the mouth of the Mississippi, the importance of which is felt by both parties in the contest now being waged. In 1812, the first portion of this newly-acquired territory was admitted into the Union as a State under the name of *Louisiana*, and as slavery had already existed within it since its French colonization, it was not objected to now. In 1818, the inhabitants of the present State of *Missouri* applied for admission into the Union on equal terms with the citizens of Louisiana; the people of the Free States and their representatives in Congress objected to this request, and after two years of discussion, it was granted only with the understanding that, in future, no State formed out of this territory lying north of a certain latitude (36 deg. 30 min.) should be admitted as a Slave State. And the Fugitive Slave Clause of the Constitution was also expressly coupled with this admission. This was the celebrated "*Missouri Compromise*," passed in 1820, and passed to appease Southern

threats of separation. Accordingly, when, in 1836, the people of *Arkansas*, to the south of this line, applied for admission into the Union as a State, the North made no opposition to their request, abiding unhesitatingly by the terms of this compact ; and so likewise with *Florida* in 1845, formed out of the territory purchased from Spain in 1821. Texas, which was colonized and violently torn from Mexico by filibustering bands of Southerners, and in which slavery, after it had been abolished by Mexico, was re-established, was annexed to the United States in 1845, in spite of the earnest opposition of the majority of the Northern people, but in deference to the customary threats of the South. Then came the disgraceful war with Mexico in 1846, which Mr. Calhoun, to his honour, opposed. By this war, which cost us at least 25,000 lives, and £40,000,000 ("Ludlow," p. 218), and by subsequent purchase from Mexico, we acquired the vast provinces of California, New Mexico, Utah, and Upper California. In 1847-8, the Northern representatives in Congress endeavoured to have passed a law excluding slavery for ever from these territories ; all the Free-State members, save nine, voted in favour of the law, and it was carried in the Lower House, but rejected in the Senate. About the same time, on the question of a territorial Government for Oregon, which lies to the north of the "*Missouri Compromise*" line, Mr. Calhoun endeavoured to have this line extended to the Pacific, so that *California*, lying to the south of it, should be brought within the sphere of slavery ; and on this being refused, declared, "The separation of the North and the South is completed." In 1848, slavery was excluded from *Oregon territory* ; the people of *California*, too, prohibited the institution within the limits of their territory. In 1850, when the question of the admission of the latter as a State, and the organization of the territories of New Mexico and Utah, were discussed, *California* was admitted, excluding slavery, and the two territories were constituted, leaving the question of slavery undecided in them ; and the domestic slave-trade was abolished in the district of Columbia. In compensation for these gains to the anti-slavery cause, certain enactments were made to enforce the Fugitive Slave Law provision of the Constitution. Mr. Calhoun had already announced the *Missouri Compromise* measure as unconstitutional, insisting that Congress had no right to make any law which should discriminate in favour of the interests of one class of citizens to the detriment of another, in other words, to declare that any portion of the common territories should be defined as *anti-slavery* territory, thereby rendering it inexpedient, or impossible, for slave-owners to settle in them. But Mr. Calhoun was a member of the Cabinet at the time of the adoption of this Compromise, and a majority of the Cabinet, and the President himself, who signed the Bill, were slaveholders, and it was accepted.

by the South as a measure eminently favourable to the slavery interest. Moreover, this Bill gave to the South the States of Missouri, Arkansas, and Florida, which it did not scruple to accept, by virtue of this compact and this only. And, still further, the South, led by Mr. Calhoun himself, insisted, as we have seen, that this same *Missouri Compromise* line should be extended to the Pacific, in order to make California available to slavery. All this shows that Mr. Calhoun and his party had no scruples on the score of the constitutionality of the measure, so long as slavery was promoted thereby, although they knew well that the provision in favour of slavery acted as a barrier to the immigration into these territories of free-labour settlers. However, to conciliate the South, when the organization of the Kansas and Nebraska territories was considered, in 1854, Mr. Douglas, *Senator from the Free State of Illinois*, introduced his Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which proposed to abrogate the *Missouri Compromise* law in favour of slavery in these territories, and to extend to them the operation of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. This Bill did not direct that slavery *should be sanctioned* in these territories, but it left the question, for or against its establishment therein, to be settled by the inhabitants themselves. But the passage of this Bill by Congress aroused the people of the Free States to a keener perception of their disgrace and their weakness than they had ever previously acquired. It convinced them that no compromise, however sanctioned by time and by advantages secured to the South, could be relied upon as permanent or binding. But the cup was not yet quite full; it overflowed, however, on the addition of the "*Dred Scott*" decision of the Supreme Court, by which it was decreed that slave-owners may take their slaves, like any other property, into any Free State or territory, which *by law has been made free*, without thereby losing their right to hold such property (so much for Southern deference to *State-rights* when these are not supposed to be beneficial to *themselves*). But, worse still, Chief Justice Taney asserted that free negroes "had no rights which the white man was bound to respect, and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit; that this opinion was at that time (of the adoption of the Constitution) fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race, and was regarded as an axiom in morals as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing, or supposed to be open to dispute;" consequently, that free negroes could not be, and were not, *citizens of the United States*, though they might be *and are* of particular States (and this, notwithstanding that express clause of the Federal Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States").—(See Professor Cairnes' "The Slave Power," p. 216; "Ludlow," op. cit., pp. 264-7.)

But this accumulation of encroachments on and violations of the spirit of the Constitution, and of solemn compacts made with the South, wrought its own cure. Kansas, after a hard-fought battle, waged during seven years, against all the efforts of Slave State desperadoes, and the influence of the General Government, was gained for free labour; the democratic party at the North was broken up; the supremacy of the South, in the Union, destroyed; Mr. Douglas, who had sold the birth-right of freedom for "a mess of pottage," (and such a mess!) was defeated in his aim at the Presidency, and the republican party, unsuccessful in 1856, triumphed in 1860.

No better "summing up" of the encroaching career of the Slave States and the system of slavery can be made, than that of the *Times*, published January 4th, 1861:—"No stretch of fanaticism on the part of the North has been so extravagant as the doctrines now openly avowed by the South. The Slave States have long ceased to be content with sufferance. In their passionate effrontery they have loudly declared that slavery, so far from being a blemish, is a positive blessing to a country; that it is the only true basis of labour, and the best cement of social institutions. They have claimed the right, not only of preserving it for the present, but of perpetuating it for all time, and of extending it into every territory annexed to the American Union. One by one they have set aside all barriers in the shape of limits and compromises, and have driven their principles by sheer force down the throats of their opponents."

How delighted and surprised the South must be to find that the *Times* has now become her chief advocate and defender in Europe!

As to any actual *grievance*, the South has never pretended to have any which will bear a moment's serious examination. The *Tariff policy* of the country, Mr. Calhoun himself admitted, could not be alleged as such, because the South, as a whole, was not averse to it. The only matter in which any pretension to injury has been alleged is, that, from time to time, a slave has made his escape from bondage, (having been in some instances *enticed* away,) and found shelter in a Free State; and that when the master attempted to reclaim him, he was frequently more or less obstructed in, and sometimes prevented from, regaining him, sometimes by the interposition of State laws, sometimes by individual opposition. I do not mean to uphold the right or duty of any Free State, or free inhabitant thereof, to disobey or connive at disobedience to the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, which expressly enjoined that a runaway slave should be given up to his master. But when a poor wretch, to escape a slave's work, or a slave's punishment, or the recollection of a slave's punishment, has surmounted the difficulties and dangers in the way of his deliverance,

—the swamp, the forest, the armed patrol, the chance passer-by, the hunger and thirst, the hunter and the hounds, (see Olmsted, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-163,)—one cannot but feel that he has earned the right to be free. To have been willing to encounter all the dangers to which a runaway negro knows he will be exposed, there must have been, in most instances, one may suppose, a condition of things on the plantation, to which the master would do well not to attract attention, by an attempt to drag the runaway back. Southerners, indeed, say that only the worthless try to escape, as a general rule; then why incur all the expense and annoyance of endeavouring, perhaps unsuccessfully, to recover such?

The slavery question, so far as scriptural warrant for the return of fugitive slaves is concerned, has, thanks to Southern agitation during the last fifty years, been so much discussed at the North, that every one in that section now knows the Bible says, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him."—Deut. xxiii. 15, 16; and knows also that St. Paul, in returning *Onesimus* to his master, by no means intimates that it is a duty to return fugitive slaves to their masters, as the modern advocates of slavery have urged. No candid reader of this celebrated Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon can draw from it any other inference than this, viz., that a *Christian* has no scriptural warrant to hold a *fellow-Christian* as a slave; but that he is *commanded* by it, as a necessary and intended result of the Christian profession, to *substitute for the pagan and Jewish chain of slavery the Christian bond of brotherhood*.

If the Southern master would, in compliance with this injunction of St. Paul, to whom he has so confidently appealed, treat his slave as "Not now a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved," there would be no fugitives from such a bondage. Until this transformation of belief and practice shall occur, however, the only apostolical warrant for slavery, or a Fugitive Slave Law, is to be found in the fraternity of *Southern "Bishops in the Apostolical succession."*

But apart from objections to the propriety of the Fugitive Slave Law on scriptural grounds, the Northern people had other reasons of dissatisfaction with it. The original proviso in the Constitution, and that also which was attached to the Missouri Compromise Bill of 1820, did not order that *State or Municipal authorities* should enforce the law, and the Courts have repeatedly decided that no such duty was imposed upon such officers, but that *Federal officers* must execute *Federal laws*. And as to the last Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, it has been pronounced unconstitutional, not only by Northern Courts, but likewise by South Carolina jurists, and a South Carolina judicatory.—(Story, "*The American Question*," pp. 57, 58.)

Another fact which shows how little weight is to be attached to the reality of this pretended grievance is, that the complaint comes from the central Slave States, from which the escape of a slave has, from their very position, been a rare occurrence. The Border Slave States, Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, and even Virginia and Tennessee, have made little or no complaint, though they were subjected to the losses. In fact, in the Convention of South Carolina, held at the time of Secession, her most prominent men, Rhett, Parker, Keitt, and Inglis, distinctly declared that "Secession was not occasioned by the non-execution of the Fugitive Slave Law," nor by any other grievance; but that it had been contemplated for thirty years; and the actual Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, Mr. Stephens, assured the legislature and people of Georgia, after the election of Mr. Lincoln, "that the rights of the South had been, and could still be, secured under the Federal Constitution," and opposed Secession.

As an offset to, and as cause for, in some measure the unwillingness of the Northern people to return fugitive slaves, a thousand grievances might be adduced to show how lightly Southerners have esteemed the provisions of the Constitution in favour of the rights and privileges of Northern travellers or residents in the Free States. The mail-bags have been unceremoniously searched, as an habitual thing, for years past, for suspected correspondence, or newspapers, or other publications; a watch has been kept upon Northern men at the South suspected of entertaining abolition sentiments; unoffending Northern men have been arrested on suspicion of holding such opinions, by self-constituted authorities, tried by "Lynch-law," banished the State, maltreated and sometimes murdered; free coloured citizens, seamen, or passengers, from Northern ports, arriving in Northern or other vessels, have as a constant custom, and *by State law*, been imprisoned until the vessel was about sailing. And all this in defiance of an explicit article of the Constitution, which says, "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." And when the State of Massachusetts sent to her sister State of South Carolina a most respectable man, on the peaceful mission of instituting a suit in the District Court of South Carolina, to test the constitutionality of this State law, this gentleman, and his daughter who accompanied him, were almost immediately set upon by the populace of Charleston, and their lives were saved only by the gentlemen of the city, who surrounded the carriage in which they placed themselves, and escorted it to a place of safety. But, notwithstanding the aversion of the Northern people to the Fugitive Slave Law, they felt that it was *the law*, and, therefore, abode by it; and, in the vast majority of cases, fugitive slaves were allowed to be arrested, and, if properly



adjudicated upon, to be returned to their masters, although the execution of the law would have been manifestly impossible, had there been any general or organized attempt at resisting it.

In one sense, this pro-slavery struggle has been, on the part of the South, *in self-defence*, viz., for the purpose of keeping in the United States Senate a sufficient number of votes, if not to constitute a majority, at least to ensure so powerful a minority, that no legislation hostile to the slavery interest of the South could be accomplished. Hence the determination to add State for State, more or less "*pari passu*" with the North; and this was done quite successfully up to the admission of California, in 1850.

But this, apparently and alleged, self-defensive policy was, in reality, an aggression of the most hostile kind, not only upon the constitutional rights of the people of the Free States, but upon the Constitution itself; for, at the beginning, the country was intended to be a *free country*; slavery, which already existed in it, was looked upon as a *temporary evil* which, as the framers of the Constitution and the wiser part of the slave-owners themselves intended and believed, would soon come to a natural end. Hence the whole spirit of the Constitution was made favourable to freedom, and opposed to slavery; and it has been by gross perversion and distortion of its principles and provisions, that it has been made a perpetual warrant for slavery as well as an Ark of Liberty. But, as in all cases of continued violation of justice, the national wrong has brought its own punishment and curse. The North, for its complicity in the crime, had become degraded in its own estimation and in the opinion of the world, and is now "reaping the whirlwind" of civil war; the South has had its rich inheritance of natural advantages wasted and blasted, the mass of its people steeped in "hopeless ignorance, poverty, and crime," and is now, with a millstone of slavery about its neck, plunged into a fathomless rebellion.

Besides this ambition for political power, the South has been *greedy for gold*, gold not obtained by the labour and industry of its own people, but by the unrecompensed and enforced toil of negro slaves. There is no population in the world more desirous of wealth than "*the chivalry*" of the American Slave States, not that they may hoard it, (for they are liberal, even lavish,) but that they may have it to expend upon their own pleasures, upon the purchase of fresh slaves and new lands, as well as for the improvement of themselves and their children. Any one who has visited the two great sections of our country, the North and the South, who knows the comparative comfort and progress of the two peoples, the sums expended in each for purposes of public benefit and improvement, and who appreciates the different modes in which the money for securing these comparative amounts of well-doing and well-being have

been acquired, such an one must laugh at, as being supremely absurd, the assertions of Southerners as to what they call "*Yankee greed for gold*," as compared with their own.

Travellers' reports are full of exemplifications. Here is one taken from the letter of a correspondent of a London journal. After alluding to some resolutions presented recently in the Confederate Congress by Senator Foote, of Mississippi, to the effect that the Southern Confederacy would be disposed, its independence being acknowledged, to form a commercial treaty, or even an offensive and defensive alliance, with all the States of the Union, "excepting those of New England, with whose people *and in whose ignoble love of gold and brutifying fanaticism* this disgraceful war has mainly originated," the writer says, "Considering that babies of all ages form an article of merchandise amongst Mr. Foote's constituents, I think his charging the New Englanders with an '*ignoble love of gold*,' is, to say the least, not becoming. I was seated with a party of a dozen '*citizens*' round the hall stove of the '*Planter's Hotel*,' in Vicksburg, six years ago, when, after we had all chewed our quids and spat in silence for about half-an-hour, a gentleman opposite me asked us '*if any one would like to buy a boy*;' on further inquiry he stated that 'he had raised him himself and could show the mother.' A would-be purchaser went out with him to examine the 'boy,' and during their absence the remainder of the party discussed the state of the man-markets, in a slow and sententious way that was very edifying. I then learned that there was not one of the party who had not bought, or sold, men, women, and children, during the previous year, and they were all of opinion that *there was more money to be made on likely 'young niggers'* than on anything else in the markets."—(London *Daily News*, Feb. 19th, 1863.)

The wonderful increase in the demand for cotton, created in England by the improvements in the spinning and weaving of this material, from 1767 to 1787, and the new method invented in America, in 1793, for the better cleansing and preparing of the fibre, augmented enormously the cultivation and production of the cotton plant in the Southern States, between 1794 and 1800 (from £100,000 to £3,000,000), and ever since the supply has been steadily and rapidly increasing, so that in 1859 the value of the American cotton crop was estimated at £40,000,000. This led, of course, to a proportionately growing demand for an increased supply of slave-labour, the white population of the Slave States not being willing to work. And as the foreign slave-trade had been abolished in 1808, and declared piracy in 1820, the South looked to Virginia, Maryland, and Kentucky, chiefly, for the needed assistance. Hence, the earnest wish and effort of the early slaveholders, especially of Virginia, to secure the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade,

received a check in the early part of the present century, ceased entirely in the Slave States south of Virginia, as the demand for cotton increased, and has since become supplanted by a still more passionate longing for the re-establishment of the foreign slave-trade, for the extension and development of the domestic slave-trade (which has, for several years past, been estimated to yield annually 25,000 slaves, valued at from £4,000,000 to £5,000,000,) and for the indefinite and boundless acquisition of slave territory.

Thus it was *Southern "greed for gold,"* and not "*the fanaticism of Northern abolitionists,*" which gave such a wonderful impetus and extension to the system of Southern slavery; which, in Southern estimation, has changed its whole moral and social aspect, making it now "a moral and humane institution, productive of the greatest political and social advantages," "the surest and most solid foundation in the world for free institutions," "the very corner-stone of our Republican edifice."

In all her measures for self-aggrandisement, the South, it must be confessed, has been aided by Northern politicians; indeed, without such assistance she could not have accomplished them. And it was the conviction that this resource would hereafter fail them which induced the Southern leaders, after the success of the Republican party in 1860, to quit the Union. If Fremont had been elected in 1856, they would have, perhaps, resorted to the step then, but the four years of respite enabled them to mature their plans and concentrate their preparations.

By a long and unexampled career of *material prosperity*, political virtue at the North had become corrupted, and temporarily, at least, destroyed, as was military discipline with Hannibal's soldiers after their success at Cannæ. True patriots, even, feared to take that decided stand against slavery which their convictions dictated, lest discord, disunion and civil war should ensue; politicians dared not oppose the growing power and encroachments of the slave interest, lest their respective political parties should lose some election, or fail to gain some patronage; business men and capitalists made no sign, lest commerce, trade and the finances of the land should suffer; even the great religious bodies in the Free States were generally false to their high responsibilities, lest the religious calm of their respective communions should be disturbed, and their collections for religious purposes diminished; like false prophets, they cried, "Peace, peace, when there was no peace." In fact, the North needed some terrible social and political convulsion to purify the moral atmosphere. And at last, thank God, who in wrath remembers mercy, it came. Mr. Bright has well said, "There seemed no way short of a miracle, more stupendous than any recorded in Holy Writ, which would in our day, or in a century, have brought about the abolition of slavery in

America, but the suicide which the South has committed, and the war it is now waging."

### THE FUTURE CAREER OF THE SLAVE POWER.

But the right to extend slavery over the *actual territories of the United States* was not the only object which the South had in view even before Secession; and their ambition is not now bounded *by the actual limits of the Southern Confederacy*. The range of vision extends beyond, to wherever slavery may be profitably transported or extended. This is plainly stated in the address of the Rev. Dr. Palmer; it was foreshadowed in the filibustering expeditions of Lopez and Walker, the funds for which, and the men constituting them, were furnished chiefly by Southern planters, and the secrets of which were well known to prominent men in the present Confederate Government. The *Times*, too, had an inkling of the probable career of the South, when, on the 31st July, 1861, it intimated that Mexico would come under the Southern dominion: it said, "The hopes of conquest to the Southward, which Mr. Jefferson Davis and his friends have cherished for so long, *seem likely to be realized*, should the seceders succeed in establishing their independence. If, on the other hand, the Union be re-cemented by force, the North will be able to give a rich bribe to the slave-owners, by allowing them to add to the Federal territory the beautiful land which is now lapsing into barbarism." (The Emancipation Proclamation, and the law establishing freedom for ever over all the actual and possible territories of the United States, have settled the question of the "bribe.") So, also, the *Financial Agent of the Confederacy*, who may be supposed to know something of the sources whence his patron Government hopes to derive its revenues, pictures in glowing language the probable spread of its "empire in the future, extending from the home of Washington to the ancient palaces of Montezuma, uniting the proud old colonies of England with Spain's richest and most romantic dominions, combining the productions of the great valley of the Mississippi with the mineral riches, the magical beauty, the volcanic grandeur of Mexico." (Spence's "American Union," p. 286.) How naturally this rich prospect makes the imagination of the "Financier" to glow!

" Ah non sapete  
I simpatici effetti prodigiosi,  
Che produce in lui la dolce idea dell'oro !  
All'idea di quel metallo  
Portentoso, onnipossente  
Un vulcano la sua mente  
Già comincia a diventar."—(FIGARO.)

But, presently, the "*Financial Agent*," as if afraid of having

allowed so weighty a secret to escape him, of having exhibited too much of the fangs and the terrible claws of his pet, re-clothes it in the sheep-skin in which it suits the policy of the English friends of the South that the Confederacy should, at present, appear; and, a few pages further on, says, "Be our ignorance of the merits of this question never so great, we behold a country of vast extent and large numbers earnestly desiring self-government. It threatens none, demands nothing, attacks no one, but wishes to rule itself, and desires to be 'let alone.'"—(P. 291. See also Professor Cairnes, p. 174.)

### THE RE-OPENING OF THE SLAVE-TRADE.

Nor is it extension of territory alone that the South craves. It looks to the *re-establishment of the African slave-trade* as a prime necessity of its progress, and as an essential element of this progress. Mr. Russell seems to have become persuaded of this from his intimate association with prominent Southern gentlemen during his visit to the Southern States. He says of the war, "The issue to them is one of life and death. Whoever raises it hereafter, if it be not decided now, must expect to meet the deadly animosity which is now displayed towards the North. The success of the South—if they do succeed—must lead to complications and results in other parts of the world, for which neither they nor Europe are prepared. Of one thing there can be no doubt—*a Slave State cannot long exist without a slave-trade*. The poor whites who have won the fight, will demand their share of the spoils; the land for tilth is abundant, and all that is wanted to give them fortunes is a supply of slaves. They will have that in spite of their masters, unless a stronger power than the Slave States prevents the accomplishment of their wishes."—(Russell's "*Diary*," vol. i., p. 423.)

But we have stronger testimony still as to the views of the Southern leaders with reference to the slave-trade. One reason why the South failed in an attempt to get possession of Kansas territory in 1856-61 was, manifestly, that slave-owners were not able to colonize it in sufficient numbers; had slaves been cheaper, this difficulty would not have existed. Accordingly, the South began to address itself to the removal of this obstacle to their progress. Governor Adams, of South Carolina, in his address to the Legislature in 1857, denounced the prohibition of the slave-trade by Congress in 1808 "as a violation of the Constitution, inasmuch as it discriminated in opposition to the interests of the South." The Southern press freely discussed and advocated the re-opening of the foreign slave-trade. The *Charleston Standard* said, "To the end of changing our attitude in the contest, and of planting our standard right in the faces of our adversaries, we propose, as a leading principle

of Southern policy, to re-open and legitimate the slave-trade."—(Cairnes, p. 207, 208.) In the latter part of the year 1856, a commercial convention was held at Savannah to discuss the interests and requirements of the South; here the re-opening of the African slave-trade was publicly debated, delegates from Virginia, Texas, and Alabama supported the measure, others objected to it.—(Ludlow's "History of the United States," p. 264.) The Hon. L. W. Spratt, of South Carolina, advocated it; he said, "The first reason for its revival is, it will give political power to the South. Imported slaves will increase our representation in the National Legislature. More slaves will give us more States; and it is, therefore, within the power of the rude, untutored savages we bring from Africa to restore to the South the influence she has lost by the suppression of the trade. We want only that kind of population which will extend and secure our peculiar institutions, and there is no other source but Africa."—(Cairnes, p. 208.) *Mr. Stephens, now the Vice-President of the Confederacy*, declared, "We can divide Texas into five Slave States, and get Chihuahua, Sonora, &c., if we have the slave population, and it is plain that, *unless the numbers of the African stock be increased*, we have not the population, and might as well abandon the race with our brethren of the North in the colonization of the territories. Slave States cannot be made without Africans. I am not telling you to do it, but it is a serious question concerning our political and domestic policy; and it is useless to wage war about abstract rights, or to quarrel and accuse each other of unsoundness, unless we get more Africans. Negro slavery is but in its infancy." (Ibid.) And *Mr. Jefferson Davis himself, now President of the Confederacy*, while declaring his disapprobation of opening the trade in *Mississippi*, earnestly disclaimed "*any coincidence of opinion with those who prate of the inhumanity and sinfulness of the trade*. The interest of Mississippi, not of the African, dictates my conclusion. Her arm is, no doubt, strengthened by the presence of a due proportion of the servile caste, but it might be paralyzed by such an influx as would probably follow if the gates of the African slave-market were thrown open. This conclusion, in relation to Mississippi, is based upon my view of *her present condition, not upon general theory*. It is not supposed to be applicable to Texas, to New Mexico, or to any future acquisitions to be made south of the Rio Grande."—(Ibid, p. 209.)

It must be admitted that the Southerners are *consistent*; if they adopt a principle, they carry it out, so far as they can. Conventions have been held all over the South in favour of the legitimization of the slave-trade with Africa. At one held in *Vicksburg*, in 1859, a vote in favour of the proposition was passed by a large majority; and an "*African Labour Supply Association*" was constituted, of which Mr. De Bow, the editor of the leading Southern Review,

was made President. In *Alabama*, a "*League of United Southerners*" declared the Federal prohibition of the slave-trade to be "an unworthy concession to the demands of Northern fanaticism;" in the *Senate of Arkansas*, a majority of twenty-two rejected a motion condemning the attempt to restore the slave-trade; in the *Louisiana Legislature*, a Bill favouring this re-establishment was passed in the Lower House, and lost in the Upper only by a small majority; in *Georgia*, the executive committee of an agricultural society offered "a premium of twenty-five dollars for the best specimen of a live African imported within the last twelve months, to be exhibited at the next meeting of the Society;" in *Mississippi*, the *True Southern* newspaper suggested the propriety of stimulating "the zeal of the pulpit by founding a prize for the best sermon in favour of free-trade in negroes." And it seems too true that the African slave-trade was carried on quite briskly at the South; throughout the years 1859 and 1860, slavers arrived in Southern ports, with but little interference from the Federal Government, and most of these vessels, probably, belonged to New York.—(Cairnes, p. 209–211.) (Those who are disposed, however, to point the finger at Northern Americans for their share in the carrying on of the slave-trade, must not forget the assertion of Lord Brougham, within a year,—that he had received letters from eminent British merchants, stating that propositions had been made to them by other British friends, to engage in the African slave-trade under French colours, since the United States Government had hung a convicted slaver, and had granted the right of search to British cruisers.)

But it may be objected that the quotations I have produced refer to the sentiment prevalent at the South *prior to Secession*, and that the necessity at that time felt for slave-colonization, in order to restore the lost political equilibrium in the Union and in Congress, ceased with Secession, and has ceased for ever. It may be said, also, that, by the Constitution of the Southern Confederacy, it has been provided that "the importation of negroes of the African race from any foreign country other than the slave-holding States or territories of the United States of America, is hereby forbidden; and Congress is required to pass such laws as shall effectually prevent the same." And that another article exists to the effect that, "Congress shall also have power to prohibit the introduction of slaves from any State not a member of, or territory not belonging to, this Confederacy." But these articles of the Constitution, introduced for political purposes to be presently shown, can be repealed, or modified, within a very short time, according to the method established by the Constitution itself; and it cannot be doubted that such modification would be demanded and accomplished if it should be deemed expedient. And, again, I am not aware that the Southern Congress ever has "passed such laws as shall effectually

prevent the same" free-trade in African negroes. At all events, we do know that great disgust was manifested in most of the States by these provisions of the Constitution. The same Mr. Spratt, a prominent man in South Carolina, the editor of the *Charleston Mercury*, a member of the South Carolina Convention at the Secession period, and a Commissioner from that State to her sister Slave States, to urge them to join her in seceding,—this gentleman, in an essay on the "*Philosophy of Secession*," published after the fact, argues strongly in favour of the re-opening of the slave-trade,—as strongly after Secession as before. He contends that the slave-breeding States ought not to have *their interests as slave-producers fostered to the detriment of the slave-consuming States*; and as to *European nations*, to conciliate whose goodwill the article was introduced into the Constitution, he says of them, "*They will submit to any terms of intercourse with the Slave Republic in consideration of its markets and its products. An increase of slaves will increase the market and supply. They will pocket their philanthropy and the profits together.*" And so, solicitude as to the feeling of foreign States upon this subject is gratuitous; and so it is that our suppression of the slave-trade is warranted by no necessity to respect the sentiment of foreign States. I truly think we want more slaves. We want them to the proper cultivation of our land, to the just development of our resources, and to the proper constitution of society. Even in this State (South Carolina) I think we want them; of 18,000,000 of acres of land, less than 4,000,000 are in cultivation. We have no seamen for our commerce, if we had it, and no operatives for the arts; but it is not for that I now oppose restrictions on the slave-trade. I oppose them from the wish to *emancipate our institution. I regard the slave-trade as the test of its integrity. If that be right, then slavery is right, but not without*; and I have been too clear in my perception of the claims of that great institution—too assured of the failure of antagonist democracy, too convinced the one presents the conditions of social order, too convinced the other does not, and too convinced, therefore, that the one must stand while the other falls, to abate my efforts or pretermitt the means by which it may be brought to recognition and establishment. Believing, then, that this is a test of slavery, and that the institution cannot be right if the trade be not, *I regard the Constitutional prohibition as a great calamity.* I was the single advocate of the slave-trade in 1853; *it is now the question of the time.*" (Lecture by Professor Cairnes on "*the Revolution in America*," pp. 10, 11.)

From all these evidences, then,—opinions of prominent Southern men, including the *President and Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy*, resolutions of Southern State Legislatures, and popular Conventions,—it appears to me quite certain that the re-opening of



the African slave-trade would be a settled policy of the South, should the Confederacy succeed in establishing its independence.

This conclusion derives additional strength from the fact that *the Southern Congress did, so soon as it met, actually pass a Bill* the effect of which was to modify very materially the United States law against the slave-trade, but so as to *favour and encourage the traffic*. The Federal law makes this trade piracy, and punishes with death at least the captain of a slaver caught in the act, and found guilty on trial; and the practice has been to *send back to Africa*, to the republic of Liberia, the slaves found on board a captured slave-ship. But *the Bill passed by the Confederate Congress* proposed that *the slave-trade should no longer be regarded as piracy*, but a simple infraction of law, to be punished by confiscation of the vessel caught in the act, and *public sale of the slaves, for the benefit of the Government*. It is easy enough to see that such a law as this would be an immense encouragement to the slave-trade. Even if the law should be executed, (but who would complain of the guilty parties?) the persons engaged in the venture could always re-purchase both ship and cargo, and still make enormous profits. It is well known that, even if two out of three slavers are completely lost, the traders vastly more than pay all losses by the profits on the third. Mr. Davis had wisdom enough to see that such a law as this would open the eyes of Europe, and accordingly he vetoed it, giving his reasons in a *secret message* to the Congress, Feb. 28th, 1861, *just ten days after his inauguration*. This shows that the re-opening of the slave-trade was one of the desires uppermost in the hearts of the Confederate legislators, and which they lost no time to declare.—(“*Annuaire des deux Mondes*,” 1861, pp. 585, 586.) What were *the motives assigned for the veto*, one can fancy; *what the President’s real opinions are concerning* the re-opening of the trade, in certain contingencies, we have already seen. And, again, another confirmatory fact has just come to light through an intercepted despatch from the Secretary of State of the Confederacy to the Confederate Commissioner at St. Petersburg. In this despatch, the Secretary directs the Commissioner (in the event of any disposition, on the part of the Russian Government, to introduce into any negotiation, a stipulation against the re-opening of the slave-trade by the Confederacy) to “assume the position that the Constitution of the latter is a compact entered into between independent States, in other words, that no power has been delegated to the Government on the subject.” The despatch continues, “We trust that no unnecessary discussions on this matter will be introduced into your negotiations. If, unfortunately, this reliance should prove ill-founded, you will decline continuing negotiations on your side, and transfer them to us at home, where, in such an event, they can be conducted with

greater facility and advantage under the direct supervision of the President.”—(*Journal des Débats*, April 22nd, 1863.)

And who will prevent the Southern Confederacy, at the expense of a new war, from legalizing and re-opening the African slave-trade under a more powerful *prétige*, and with a fiercer zeal, than it has ever enjoyed before? The *interest of England* will be evoked more loudly than now in favour of a supply of cotton; and perhaps the British people may verify the prediction of the Hon. Mr. Spratt, “They will pocket their philanthropy and cotton together,” and allow the Confederacy to get slaves wherever they can on the *free-trade* principle.

Now, in view of this career, and these evident intentions of the South, can any one *really believe* that, excepting from some direful necessity, the Southerners themselves will ever abolish slavery? Can any one *really believe* that, if the war were to cease now, slavery would come to an end? When Europe is anxiously waiting for a fresh supply of Southern cotton, and would only be too happy to return to its dependence upon the slave-labour of the South, when the Confederacy shall have nobly won its hard-fought fight, and, shall be flushed with the pride of success, will she give up *the very object* for which she has fought so bravely and so perseveringly? *Never!* Even now, after two years of war, and when the ultimate success of the Confederacy is, to say the least, doubtful, and when it has become manifest that one of the greatest obstacles in the way of European, and especially of English, interference and direct governmental aid in its favour, is its relationship to slavery,—the South is still, and more firmly than ever, wedded to her idol. The *Richmond Examiner*, one of the principal organs and leaders of public opinion in the South, after alluding to the high reputation which the Southern armies and their leaders have won for themselves (and deservedly) in England, the successful negotiation of the Southern Loan, the assistance afforded in the building and fitting-out of war-ships, &c., says, “If the Confederacy is at a premium, she owes it to herself. And so much the better. We shall be all the more free to run the grand career which opens before us, and grasp our own lofty destiny. Would that all of us understood and laid to heart the true nature of that career and that destiny, and the responsibility it imposes. The establishment of the Confederacy is verily a distinct reaction against the whole course of the mistaken civilization of the age. And this is the true reason why we have been left without the sympathy of the nations until we conquered that sympathy with the sharp edge of our sword. For ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,’ we have deliberately substituted Slavery, Subordination, and Government. Those social and political problems which rack and torture modern society we have undertaken to solve for ourselves, in our own way, and upon

our own principles. That 'among equals equality is right,'—among those who are naturally unequal, equality is chaos,—that there are slave races born to serve, master races born to govern,—such are the fundamental principles which we inherit from the ancient world, which we lifted up in the face of a perverse generation that has forgotten the wisdom of its fathers; by those principles we live, and in their defence we have shown ourselves ready to die. Reverently we feel that our Confederacy is a God-sent missionary to the nations, with great truths to preach. We must speak them boldly; and whoso hath ears to hear, let him hear . . . . We start fair when our soldiers shall have sheathed their bloody weapons; then will come the task of our sages and statesmen in building up society and uttering by word and act the truths which are its base; and thank God, the Confederates have some statesmen and thinkers up to the mark and level of the situation. There are men in these Confederate States who have long deeply felt and earnestly striven to express, though timidly and speculatively, on what foundations of fact, with what corner agents of principle, our social situation was one day to be built up fair and bright. Now is the time. Let them speak in no apologetic tone, nor place us, at their peril, in any deprecatious attitude. 'This people has won the right surely 'to be let alone.' They will accept no deduction in politics, in literature, in philosophy; they will not follow but lead, not borrow but lend. They are more than content with their own principle of morals and way of life, and will stand upon it to the end, so help them God.'—(*Richmond Examiner*, May 28th, 1863; quoted in the *Daily News*, June 15th.)

So much for the political career and designs of the South at home. And in foreign politics Southern influence, which has always been predominant in the councils of the nation, has manifested the same spirit of encroachment on the rights and dignity of other countries, since the earlier Presidents, as it has upon the integrity of the Federal Constitution. The two fundamental principles of Southern policy, *Cotton is King, and Slavery is his Prime Minister*, constitute the key to every act which has disgraced the foreign relations of the United States with other powers.

But in order to appreciate the true character of slavery, and its pernicious effects upon the people amongst whom it is established, we must examine into the condition of the Southern population. Their *material* situation will be more appropriately considered later; let us now inquire into their *moral and intellectual status, and their social condition*.

### THE SOCIAL CONDITION OF THE SOUTH.

Southerners seem inclined to plume themselves upon possessing a more decidedly *aristocratic* element in the composition of their

society than exists at the North. If aristocracy consists in one class of society being separated from all others by the intervention of "a great gulf," which is almost or altogether impassable to all, excepting to the few who occupy one of its charmed banks, then there is an aristocracy at the South, and none in the Free States. This class possesses all the large cotton, sugar, rice, and tobacco plantations, indeed almost all the landed property in the Slave States; it owns all the four millions of slaves, (that is to say, if every slave-owner belongs to this privileged class,) it monopolizes all the social and political advantages of its section of country, and it is the repository of most of the intelligence, and probably all the education, of the South. They have also a right to say that some of the early colonists of Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, were offshoots, more or less distinguished, of noble English families, of the times of the Charleses, and James II.

It is not worth while to admit, for every one acknowledges, that in talent, in acquirements, in elegance of manners, and in all physical attributes, Southern society abounds in brilliant specimens of men and women. I contend, however, that the numbers of such would be very much increased, that the few would become much more highly developed, if slavery were done away with, and that the whole mass of the people would be raised infinitely above their present low estate.

To be well-born is a good thing undoubtedly, *provided* it be associated with certain other qualifications, without which, like the "precious jewel" of "the toad," it is apt to render a man morally "ugly and venomous." "*Noblesse oblige*;" to be a *gentleman*, and a *wealthy gentleman*, imposes grave responsibilities; such an one must improve himself and all around him; and we may know, pretty accurately, the degree of *proper appreciation* in which such an one holds his advantages of birth and circumstances, by the amount and kind of good which he makes them accomplish. If the tree do not produce the sort of fruit it was intended to bear, we have the highest authority as to the estimate in which it should be held.

In the Free States we confess that we have no such *aristocratic* caste as exists at the South. We have abundance of wealthy men, even of large land-owners, larger, perhaps, than there are in the Slave States, but they do not by any means monopolize the wealth of the country. We have also men as well-born as any amongst our Southern brethren; though I am quite sure that we should not regard it as any honour to be descended from the English *Cavaliers*. We have many more men of much higher and more varied education; we have more men of refinement, vastly more of far greater liberality and enterprise, than exist at the South; in short, we have a much larger population, actually and relatively, calculated to

advance a country, and benefit a community. We honour labour. We do not consider that the Almighty, in condemning the human race to the necessity of toil, inflicted a curse, but rather imposed a blessing. And, if we needed any other evidence of the correctness of our conclusion than such as our common sense and our religious faith afford, we have only to look at the condition of the South, where the opposite conviction prevails.

The term *Aristocracy*, taken in the European sense, is a strange contradiction as applied to America, or Americans. An American *gentleman*, or *lady*, is equal to any other gentleman, or lady. But what possible pride can, or ought, an American to take in having been descended from the *Cavaliers* of the Stuart times? And even the English descendants of these very men, and with them the whole British people, owe their present liberties and prosperity, not to the *Cavaliers*, but to their enemies and conquerors in the great civil strife of that period. An American *ought* to be proud of the very things which most of the *Cavaliers* despised,—decency, for example, political and religious liberty, and adherence to law and Constitution. The Anglo-Saxon race in America would do better to date its nobility from our own Revolution, as Napoleon did his from *Monte-Notte*. The leading men of that period of our history were far nobler men than the, generally, worthless *Cavaliers* of the Stuart dynasty,—“Nobles by the right of an earlier creation, and by the imposition of a mightier hand.” A single drop of the blood of Washington, or Hamilton, or John Adams, would do more to render an American a good citizen of our country than “all the blood of all the Howards.” At all events, whoever will take the trouble to read the history of our Southern colonies will find that, for a hundred years, the aristocratic element was an almost insuperable disadvantage to them.

Now let us compare the two great sections of our country, one of which boasts of an aristocratic element, an aristocracy based on landed property and on slaves.

## EDUCATION AND LITERATURE.

One of the advantages claimed for the system of slavery is, that it enables the masters “to cultivate the arts, the graces, and accomplishments of life, to develope science, to apply themselves to the duties of government, and to understand the affairs of the country.”—(Russell’s “*Diary*,” vol. i., p. 214.) We submit that, in every one of these respects, excepting in the arts, graces, and accomplishments of life, the South has, thus far, and in the present generation, failed entirely. God never intended that man should be an idler; *necessity* is a far better and nobler friend to all excellencies than is *slavery*. The indolence in which slavery has enabled the master to

indulge, physically, has reacted upon and enervated his mind, (I speak of the many, not of the few brilliant exceptions,) and has indisposed him to intellectual as well as to physical labour. The consequence has been, that Southerners, since the days of the earlier Presidents, have been distinguished for nothing out of the sphere of local politics, state and national; and even in politics they have succeeded rather in *extinguishing* the Government and Constitution, than in *distinguishing* themselves. They have not been *statesmen* at all; they have been mere *politicians*, and not in the true and liberal meaning of the term. Their whole thought and vision have been concentrated upon the one matter of slavery, and they have been able to see nothing beyond it. Their intellectual grasp has become contracted and enfeebled. In science, in literature, and in the arts, the Southern "aristocracy," which has had ample leisure and means at its command, has accomplished little or nothing. Almost everything which has been done in America in these departments, and in mechanics and useful and ingenious inventions, has been done by the people of the Free States.

From the earliest period education and "the humanities" were neglected in the Southern colonies. The sons of some of the more wealthy of the planters were sent to England to be educated; but those who received this advantage must have been very few. About 1640, Sir William Berkeley, the Governor of Virginia, said, "Thank God! there are no free schools nor printing here, and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years." However, that such ideas did not continue to be those of the colonists generally, is evident from the fact that a deputation from the colony solicited from the Attorney-General under William and Mary funds for the endowment of a College, saying, that "the colonists had souls to be saved as well as the people of England." The Attorney-General replied, "Souls, — your souls, plant tobacco;" thereby showing what the idea was then in the mother-country as to the objects and uses of colonies. In the New England colonies, the people themselves attended to the important matter of education; the Massachusetts colonists had already founded Harvard University in 1638, only eighteen years after their first landing; and at the period above-mentioned, when there was no public school, nor printing establishment, nor bookseller's shop in Virginia, there existed five printing offices and as many book-stores in Boston, which was founded at least twenty years later than the Virginia colony.

Mr. Howison, the historian, says of the upper classes of Virginia, about the middle of the last century, they were "an aristocracy neither of talent, nor of learning, nor of moral worth, but of landed and slave interest." And writing of his own day, a century later, he says, "The question might be asked, Where is the literature of Virginia? and it would not be easily answered. It is a

melancholy fact, that her people have never been a reading people. In the mass they have shown an indifference to polite literature and education in general, depressing to the mind that wishes to see them respectable and happy. It is with pain that we are compelled to speak of *the horrible cloud of ignorance* that rests on Virginia." And he estimates that of the 166,000 youths in the State, between the ages of seven and sixteen years, 126,000 attended no school at all, and received no education excepting such as could be imparted by poor and ignorant parents. Besides these, he counts 449,087 slaves, and 48,852 free blacks, with few exceptions, wholly uneducated. He continues, "*The policy which discourages further extension of knowledge among them is necessary; but the fact remains unchanged that they exist among us,—a huge mass of mind almost entirely unenlightened.* We fear that the most favourable estimates will leave in our State (in 1848) 683,000 rational beings who are destitute of the merest rudiments of knowledge."—(Quoted by Olmsted, at pp. 172, 173.) The total population of Virginia in 1848 was less than 1,421,661.

The planters generally, certainly the more respectable portion of them, do not neglect the education of their own children; these are taught in Southern seminaries, or, more commonly, are sent to Northern schools and colleges. But, for the education of *the people*, scarcely anything is done by the men who monopolize the wealth and make the laws of the Slave States. They say with perfect truth, that, there, "a perfect system of common school education is almost an impossibility. Extensive plantations occupied by slaves only, independent of the exhausting crops cultivated, and continually adding to barren fields, render a perfect system of common schools impossible."—(Mr. Cobb's "Historical Sketch of Slavery," quoted by Ludlow, "History of United States," p. 189.) And he should have added, that where slaves do the labour in the midst of a large white population, for whom labour is thereby made degrading, the whites have neither the means of supporting common schools nor the desire to attend them. Then, why, I ask, perpetuate the system of slavery which, by the admission of its advocates themselves, must continually increase such great evils?

But to continue: In the State of *Louisiana*, the State Superintendent of Schools lately recommended that *at least two out of three of the directors of common schools should be required to know how to read and write.* And he declared that, in one parish, the *mark*, instead of the signature, of *twelve different directors* was affixed to a teacher's certificate.—(Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 190.)

In the *Free States* the number of *free black children* attending school is greater than that of the *free whites* in the Slave States; in *Massachusetts*, *one-sixth of the coloured children* attend school, or about the same proportion as of the children in Prussia, in which

education is more diffused than amongst any other European population.—(Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 191.)

In 1837, Governor Clark, of Kentucky, informed the Legislature that one-third of the adult population of the State were unable to write their names; and Governor Campbell, of Virginia, reported that, from the returns of ninety-eight of the clerks, it appeared that of 4,614 applications for marriage licenses in 1837, no less than 1,047 were by men unable to write their names.—(Helper, *op. cit.*, p. 434.)

According to the Census Report of 1850, in all the *Slave States*, 8·37 per cent. of the native whites, and 9·09 of the foreign whites, over twenty years of age, were unable to read or write, while in the *Free States*, only 2·40 and 6·37 per cent. respectively; in Virginia, the proportion was nearly 20 per cent., and in North Carolina over 25 per cent. The number of *schools* in the *Free States* was 62,433, or one for every 215 persons; in the *Slave States*, only 18,507, or one for every 346 persons, exclusive of 3,200,000 slaves. The *pupils* in the *public schools* in the *Free States* were 2,769,901; in the *Slave States*, 581,801. The *income* of the *public schools* in the *Free States* was £1,356,067, and of the *private academies*, £491,506; in the *Slave States*, £543,906 and £415,924 respectively. The number of *newspapers* and *periodicals* published in the *Free States* was 1,790, and their total circulation 334,146,281 copies; in the *Slave States*, 704 and 81,038,693, respectively. The number of *public libraries* in the *Free States* was 14,911, containing 3,888,234 volumes; in the *Slave States*, 695 libraries and 649,577 volumes.—(Ellison, *op. cit.*, p. 189.) The number of *patents* granted for *new inventions* was, to citizens of the *Free States*, 4,059; of the *Slave States*, 625. The *population* of the *Free States* at that time was, of whites, 13,268,470, and 196,116 free blacks; of the *Slave States*, 6,184,477 whites, 228,128 free blacks, and 3,200,304 slaves.

The literary statistics of the United States are interesting. Mr. Bigelow, in his recent volume, "*Les Etats Unis en 1863*," gives the following *scraps*, amongst other statements on this subject:—Of "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*," 310,000 copies have been sold; of *Hugh Miller's Works*, 50,000; *Sears' "Wonders of the World,"* 100,000; *Dr. Kane's "Arctic Explorations,"* in two vols., 65,000 copies (yielding \$65,000 profit to the author); *Longfellow's "Hiawatha,"* 43,000 copies; of "*Mitchell's Geography*," 1,000 copies daily; in 1857, 300,000 volumes of *Davies' "Mathematical Treatises"* were sold, and about the same number of *Sanders's "Selected Reading Books."* The works of Noah Webster have an immense sale; of his "*Elementary Spelling Book*," 35,000,000 copies have been sold, and more than a million are printed annually; about 100,000 copies of his "*Elementary Dictionary*" are sold



every year, and of his several *Dictionaries* nearly two million copies have been sold. The American Bible Society circulated, in 1858, 712,114 copies of the Bible. The cost of the printed books in 1860 was \$11,843,459, and of books, journals, and other publications, \$39,678,043. In Massachusetts alone, in 1860, \$5,968,469 worth of paper was made. Mr. Goodrich, in his "*Recollections of a Life-time*," gives the following statement of the value of the books printed and sold in the United States during the four enumerated years :—

DESIGNATION.	1820.	1830.	1840.	1850.
Elementary Books ...	\$750,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000
Classical do. ...	250,000	350,000	550,000	1,000,000
Theological do. ...	150,000	250,000	300,000	500,000
Legal do. ...	200,000	300,000	400,000	700,000
Medical do. ...	150,000	200,000	250,000	400,000
Miscellaneous do. ...	1,000,000	1,300,000	2,000,000	4,400,000
Total . . . . .	\$2,500,000	\$3,400,000	\$5,500,000	\$12,000,000

The same authority estimates the proceeds of the American publishing establishments during the year 1856 as follows :—

Of New York, \$6,000,000 ; Boston, \$2,500,000 ; New England States, \$600,000 ; Philadelphia, \$3,400,000 ; Cincinnati, \$1,300,000 ; North-Western States, \$100,000 ; District of Columbia (for the Government), \$750,000 ; Southern and South-Western States, \$750,000.

Between 1851 and 1857, inclusive, the annual importations of books amounted, in 1851, to \$494,152 ; in 1852, to \$567,715 ; in 1853, to \$723,221 ; in 1854, to \$916,889 ; in 1855, to \$893,371 ; in 1856, to \$767,308 ; in 1857, to \$884,404.

Besides these, there are large numbers of foreign journals imported—of English, 1,557,689 copies ; French, 570,655 ; German, 124,520, during the year 1862.

From the composition of the population of the two sections, it will be easy to understand in which this abundant mass of literary provision is chiefly consumed.

As to the education of *blacks*, either free or slave, it is expressly forbidden by law, under severe penalties, in the Slave States. It is all very well for the masters to talk of the folly and mistaken philanthropy of those who inveigh against the forced ignorance in which the blacks are kept, on the ground that education would only make their servitude more galling. But the question comes up as to the *right*, by which millions of human beings are held in perpetual bondage, of such a nature that its victims are compelled to "hide in the earth" the "talents" which were committed to them, and for the

proper employment of which, however few or small they may be, masters and slaves will hereafter be judged.

There is no such thing as a *Southern literature*. A literature cannot be forced; it may be assisted, but first it must be felt to be needed. The population of the Slave States is not of that kind which either desires, or can support, any important literary undertaking. There is talent enough and learning enough to make good books on very many subjects; but if their sale were confined to the Slave States, their authors and publishers would starve. At a Southern Convention held at Savannah, a few years ago, it was admitted that it was "important that the South should have a literature of her own to defend her principles and her rights." The fact that she had no such defensive means was confessed, and the cause of its non-existence was stated to be that "Southern publishers cannot get money enough to support them in their enterprises;" and the Speaker who made this statement also said that the two principal, or only, periodicals of the South, the *Southern Quarterly Review*, and the *Southern Literary Messenger*, were "literally struggling for existence, for want of material aid." And here are other striking facts bearing upon the same point:—A gentleman of Charleston, who, to build up a Southern pro-slavery literature, *from the beginning*, prepared some primers, elementary readers, &c., was obliged to send the manuscripts to the Free States to have them printed, stitched, and bound. Many of the Southern States have their codes of laws, and the annual proceedings of their Legislatures, printed in the Free States. *The Southern Review*, by Mr. De Bow, purporting to be published in New Orleans, is printed and bound in New York, &c., &c.—(Helper's "*Impending Crisis*," p. 412–423.) According to the *American Publishers' Circular*, more than nine-tenths of the publishing houses of the United States are in the Free States, and these possess not less than ninety-nine hundredths of the capital invested in this business. The Census Report for 1850 gives only twenty-four publishers for all the Slave States, and of these, ten were in Maryland alone.

The reasons why the South has no literature may be inferred from the facts already mentioned. She has not readers enough to support such an institution. Again, there is not freedom of thought, speech, and writing, at the South. The question of slavery has not, for years past, been permitted to be freely discussed, for and against. Mr. Stirling says, "In politics there is no toleration in the South."—(*Letters from the Slave States*, 1857, p. 200.) Another Englishman, Charles Mackay, (the actual correspondent of the *Times* in New York who now so thoroughly abuses and vilifies the Free States,) wrote, in 1859, "The traveller from New England and other Free States no sooner penetrates into the slave land, than he sees all around him the proofs that slavery is omnipresent. Thought is not

free ; you may talk of the dissolution of the Union as desirable and probable, abuse the President and the Ministers, speak ill of Congress, collectively and individually, be profane or immoral in your speech ; but you must not say a word against the sanctity of the 'domestic institution.'"—(Quoted by Ellison, p. 49.) Almost every State has enacted laws punishing severely any one who shall speak, write, print, publish, or circulate anything calculated to excite dissatisfaction against the system of slavery ; and the intent of these laws is generally interpreted so as to comprehend all discussion on the part of persons really friendly to the South and its true interests, and who have not the slightest wish to occasion insubordination or discontent amongst the slaves. Thus Mr. Helper, a Southerner himself, was unable to have his most valuable book published in the South, although his only aim in preparing the work was to *prove* that the system of slavery is bad in every way. And so strong was the hostility it excited amongst Southern men, that, in 1859-60, in the House of Representatives at Washington, this resolution was offered by one of them :—" That no person who has endorsed and recommended the book, or the compend from it, is fit to be Speaker of this House." And for *more than two months* the Southern members of the House prevented the election of a Speaker, because, being unable to elect their own candidate, they were unwilling to vote for that of the Republican party, who had "endorsed and recommended the book." Professor Hedrick, of the University of North Carolina, was ejected from his Professorship of Chemistry, mobbed and driven out of his native State, for no other reason than that he entertained opinions hostile to slavery, and expressed them. 'Thousands of Northern men and of Southerners who have avowed anti-slavery opinions, in the Slave States, have been subjected to all the violences of Lynch-law, even to death.

The danger apprehended by reflecting Southerners from the circulation of abolition publications, and from public discussions on slavery, is not that information will reach the *slaves*, for this is almost a physical impossibility. It is that the masses of white men in the South may become enlightened as to their true interests. This was admitted by Mr. Duff Green, the editor of Mr. Calhoun's journal, the *United States Telegraph*. He said, "The real danger of a slave insurrection is remote. We believe we have most to dread from an organized action upon the *consciences and fears of the slaveholders themselves*, from the insinuation of dangerous heresies into our schools, our pulpits, and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the weak, and diffusing among our own people a morbid sensibility on the question of slavery, that the abolitionists can accomplish their object."—(Quoted by Mr. Olmsted, "*Journeys and Explorations in the Cotton Kingdom*,"

vol. ii., p. 357.) Hence an organized *inquisition* has excluded from the South true knowledge as to the comparative merits of slavery and free labour, economically considered.

Thus, one of the objections urged by the Foreign Secretary of England against the restoration of Federal supremacy over the South, viz., that it would destroy freedom of the press, &c., is a most groundless one. Even before the war, there was no freedom at the South allowed to anti-slavery opinions. Restore the Federal supremacy, and do away with slavery, and you establish freedom in everything.

### STATE OF RELIGION.

When such an amount of wealth has accumulated in the hands of a privileged class, as is the case in the Slave States, amidst such a surrounding mass of poverty, we should look for a corresponding expenditure upon public establishments of benevolence; yet there is more money spent annually by private individuals in the city of Boston alone than in all the Slave States combined, for such institutions.

Again, compare the sums expended annually in the Free States and in the Slave States for *religious purposes*. The value of Church property in the single State of New York was, in 1850, £4,307,912, and in the whole of the Slave States, only £27,000 more. The State of New York contributed £20,000 more to the printing and circulation of the Bible than the whole of the Slave States. The Free States contributed nearly four times as much to the Tract Publication Society as the Slave States; almost one hundred times as much to General Missions; almost seven times as much to Sunday Schools; for *Home Missions*, the Free States gave £39,526, while the *Slave States gave only* £54, notwithstanding the existence within them of more than three millions of slaves, and at least as many equally ignorant whites.—(Ellison, *op. cit.*, pp. 197, 198.)

The state of *Religious Education* of the poor non-slaveholding whites of the Southern States may be judged of by the following extract from the Journal of a *Colporteur*, in South Carolina:—  
“Visited sixty families, numbering 221 souls over ten years of age; only 23 could read and 17 write. Forty-one families destitute of the Bible; average of their going to church, once in seven years; several persons, between 35 and 40 years of age, had heard but one or two sermons in their lives. Some grown-up youths had never heard a sermon or prayer until my visit, and did not know of such a being as the Saviour; and boys and girls, from 10 to 15 years old, did not know who made them. All of one family rushed away to the house of a neighbour when I knelt to pray, begging him to tell what I meant by it; other families fell on their faces instead of kneeling.”—(Olmsted, p. 510.) Other testimonials as to the con-

dition, so far as religious instruction of the poor whites in other Slave States is concerned, will appear on subsequent pages.

If such be the ignorance of the poor whites, we cannot expect that the *slaves* will be better informed on religious matters; and yet, probably, they have a certain simple, ignorant, or rather *un-reasoning faith*, beyond and superior to anything of the sort possessed by the poor white population. Meetings for religious purposes are, generally, *tolerated*, although in most, if not all, of the Slave States they are *unlawful*, excepting under certain narrow restrictions (and as an excuse for such restrictions is urged the possible danger of considerable assemblages of slaves,—religious worship may be made the excuse for conspiracies, &c. The excuse is certainly a forcible one; but the *system* makes it necessary, and *the admitted necessity* shows the *wrongfulness* of the *system*). The preachers are slaves, and many of them are said to be intelligent and persuasive in enforcing their more or less original views on religious matters. The house slaves of many families, perhaps of most, receive a certain amount of religious instruction from members of the planters' families, the ladies of which, *unquestionably*, as a general rule, feel the inconveniences and evils and sinfulness of the system, and do what they can to remedy them; they are "ministering angels" at the South as they are everywhere else; but what can they do to enlighten the four millions of slaves, and the almost as many poor whites by whom they are surrounded, and in the midst of whom they are swallowed up and lost, like stars in blackest night? We need something more than an angel to roll away the great curse which shuts up the South, as a tomb, against the spiritual resurrection of *perhaps eight millions of human beings, for whom, as yet, Christ hath risen in vain.*

*Religious instruction*, as we understand the term, is not provided for, and is not likely to be provided for, the slaves, as a class. Sometimes religion is admitted to be a good thing for them, because it is found to soften them, and render them more manageable. But, in this way, duty to God and duty to the masters are so interwoven and jumbled together, that the slaves, if they think of it at all, must regard religion as a cunningly-devised scheme, gotten up for the benefit of their owners. Mr. Olmsted quotes a sermon published by Bishop Meade, of Virginia, and intended to be read to the slaves, in which such passages as the following are found: "Pray do not think I want to deceive you, when I tell you that your masters and mistresses are *God's Overseers*, and that if you are faulty towards them, God Himself will punish you severely for it in the next world, unless you repent of it, and strive to make amends by your faithfulness and diligence for the time to come, for God Himself hath declared the same."—(Olmsted, *op. cit.*, pp. 118, 119.) No doubt God does require that men, even slaves, shall do their

duty in the particular sphere in which His providence has placed them; but the Bishop should have impressed this fact upon the masters as well as upon the slaves, and should have admitted that the latter had a right to expect enlightenment from the former, as well as these good services from the others. But it shocks one's ideas of propriety, that God should be likened to a slave-owner; that He should be placed in the same relation to the master, as the latter to the Overseer of a plantation. And it shows, too, the corrupt and grasping selfishness of the *system* which, for its own ends, finds it necessary to debase everything, *even God Himself*, to the level of its requirements and policy.

"In South Carolina, a formal remonstrance, signed by more than three hundred and fifty of the leading planters and citizens, was presented to a Methodist Clergyman who had been chosen by the *Conference* of that State, as being a cautious and discreet person to preach, especially to the slaves. It was his purpose, distinctly declared beforehand, to confine himself to verbal instruction in religious truth. "Verbal instruction," urged the remonstrants, "will increase the desire of the black population to learn. \* \* \* Open the Missionary sluice, and the current will swell in its gradual onward advance. We thus expect a progressive system of improvement will be introduced, or will follow from the nature and force of circumstances, which, if not checked, (though it may be shrouded and disguised in sophistry,) *will ultimately revolutionize our civil institutions.*" The Missionary, accordingly, retired from the field; and the local newspaper, the *Grenville Mountaineer*, in announcing the preacher's forced retirement, stated that the great body of the people were manifestly opposed to the religious instruction of their slaves, even if it were only given orally."—(Olmsted, "*Journeys*," &c., vol. ii., p. 214.)

The general rule is, undoubtedly, that religious instruction of the slaves by white teachers is discouraged. There are exceptions. Thus, *Bishop Polk*, himself the owner of *four hundred slaves*, and at present a major-general in the Confederate army, is said to be particularly attentive to his religious duties to his slaves, instructing them in the doctrines, and performing upon them all ceremonies, when proper, of the Episcopal Church. And a still more striking instance of enlightenment on the part of slave-owners in this matter was exhibited by the masters in *Liberty County, Georgia*, where "a Presbyterian Minister has been employed for many years exclusively in the moral enlightenment of the slaves, being engaged and paid for this special duty by their owners." The planters of this county have, it seems, a wide-spread reputation for liberality, intelligence, and prosperity. After labouring thirteen years with a zeal and judgment which had made him famous, this apostle to the slaves was appointed Professor of Theology in the University of South

Carolina. On retiring from his missionary labours, he addressed a valedictory to his employers. In this, he enumerated some of the obstacles to success in the work in which he had been engaged; these are chiefly, 1. The fact, that the slaves are *the property* of their owners, and hence the latter are apt "to view and treat them as instruments of labour, as a means of wealth, and to forget or pass over lightly the fact that they are what they are under the eye and government of God. There is a tendency to rest satisfied with very small and miserable efforts for their moral improvement, and to give themselves but little trouble to correct immoralities, and reform wicked practices and habits, should they do their work profitably and quietly, and enjoy health, and go on to multiply and increase upon the earth." 2. The promiscuous way in which the slaves are obliged to live almost forces them into immorality. "If family relations," continues this Clergyman, "are not preserved and protected, we cannot look for any considerable degree of moral and religious improvement. One of the chief causes of the immorality of negroes arises from the indifference both of themselves and of their owners to family relations amongst the former." 3. The absence of sufficient attention on the part of the owners to *honesty* amongst the slaves. "While some discipline their people for every act of theft committed against their own interests, they have no care whatever as to what amount of pilfering and stealing the people carry on amongst themselves." 4. Habits of intemperance. "Whatever toleration masters exercise towards the use of ardent spirits in others, they are generally inclined to show none in respect to their servants. And in effecting this reformation, masters and mistresses should set the example, for without example, precepts and persuasions are powerless."—(Quoted by Mr. Olmsted, "*Journeys*," &c., vol. ii., pp. 215–219.)

The almost universal testimony of persons cognizant of the condition of the slaves is, that those of them who are considered *religious* are superstitious, and ignorant of religious truths to an extraordinary extent. The Rev. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, says, he has "often heard the remark made by men whose standing and office in the churches afforded them abundant opportunity for observation, that the more they have had to do with coloured members of the church, the less confidence they have been compelled to place in their Christian professions."—(*Ibid.*, p. 225.)

When the *Times*' special correspondent was at the South, he visited the largest sugar plantation in Louisiana, (that of an Englishman, by-the-bye,) and was shown the young negroes. He asked one of them, "Do you know how to read or write?" he evidently did not understand the question: "Do you go to church or chapel?" a dubious shake of the head: "Did you ever hear of our Saviour?" At this point the overseer interposed, and said,

"I think we had better go on, the sun is getting hot;" and so we rode on gently through the little ones, and when we had got some distance, he said, rather apologetically, "We don't think it right to put these things into their heads so young, it only disturbs their minds, and leads them astray." "Now, in this one quarter," continues the writer, "there were no less than eighty children, some twelve, and some even fourteen years old. No education, no God! their whole life—food and play, to strengthen their muscles and fit them for the work of a slave. And when they die? 'Well,' said the overseer, 'they are buried in that field there, by their own people, and some of them have a sort of prayers over them, I believe.'—(Russell's "*Diary*," vol. i., p. 397.)

After all, what else could have been expected as to religious improvement and instruction, when we know that the *religious people* of the Slave States entertain the same opinions concerning the excellence of the "peculiar institution" as the non-religious public, and that the whole body of *Christian teachers* advocate the same doctrines concerning it as the laity? The Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian denominations of the United States have each been broken up and divided, one after another, upon the question of slavery, the Southern seceding from the Northern communions. Recently, the Convention of Southern Bishops of the Episcopal Church has solemnly ratified and sanctioned the principle laid down by the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, has declared that "*the South has planted her national life on slavery*," and that the doctrine of "*Abolition is a hateful, infidel, and pestilent heresy*." And one of the most eminent and influential of the Presbyterian divines, after having, as we have already seen, announced that the "*mission*" of the South is to establish slavery, exclaimed, "Who knows but that God may be preparing us for the blessed work of propagating slavery throughout the world?" The most recent *efflorescence* of the religious convictions of the Southern Clergy on this matter is contained in an "*Address to Christians throughout the World*," signed by nearly a hundred Ministers of various denominations, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians. In this manifesto, slavery is endorsed as "the providential, the scriptural plan for benefiting the African race;" that it "is not incompatible with our holy Christianity." And the "*Address*" condemns abolitionism as "an interference with the plans of Divine Providence," and as not having "the sign of the Lord's blessing."—(Published in the *Morning Herald*, June 15th.)

What can be expected of a community or nation, the fundamental interest of which renders "a system of common-schools impossible" (Hon. Mr. Cobb); and which avows that "the policy which discourages further extension of knowledge among the poor whites and slaves is necessary?"—(Mr. Howison, the historian.)



With regard to the *Free States*, the *Times*, in 1859, thus sketched the characteristics of a large and influential section of them, the *New England States*, into which Southern influence has scarcely penetrated, and the condition of which gives us reason to hope for a similar state of society at the South, when the blighting effects of slavery shall have ceased with the system itself:—"No community of which we have any knowledge approaches, in enlightenment and morality, to the inhabitants of this part of the Union, where, though wealth is not piled up in masses, as in New York, yet poverty hardly exists; education is universal, and the tone of society is singularly high-minded and liberal." This journal now seems desirous of robbing the Free States of the good character it accorded to them previously, while it gives to the Slave States "every virtue under heaven."

Is it asked, why it is that the South, though confessedly inferior to the North in everything which denotes progress and civilization, has yet managed to govern the country? It is simply because the Slave States have been bound together as one: while at the North the people have been broken up and divided upon many secondary questions, the one all-engrossing question of slavery has united the South. And, moreover, the people of the Free States have worshipped the Constitution and the Union, and to avert dangers to these, have yielded to the passionate threats of the slave-owners, whose great idol has been slavery.

The assertion that "the *superior constituency* of the South has chosen its best men to represent and govern her, while the North has been contented with attorneys and platform orators," is sufficiently refuted by what I have shown to be the true character and condition of the Southern constituency, and by the fact, that, in both sections, attorneys have always been the most prominent men. But in America, the legal profession is not sub-divided as in England; we call all legal men attorneys or lawyers. Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, Henry, Jay, Calhoun, Clay, Webster, Marcy, were all attorneys. For this particular crisis, prepared for in advance, the South has put forth her most able men; while at the North, the stupid routine of party arrangements was not altered, for no one anticipated such a contest as the present.

We have thus sketched the history of slavery in the United States; we have shown how it has sought and, in spite of continued peaceful opposition from the Free States, has gained political power; how completely, too, its advocates have changed their opinions and policy with regard to it; we have exhibited the plans and desires of the slaveholders as to the future career of slavery, and we have pointed out some of the necessary effects of the institution and system upon the social condition of the people.

A certain class, and a most influential class, in England has

loudly bespoken favour towards the South, in this crisis, on the ground that the *aristocratic* constitution of the Slave States renders them the natural ally of England on the American Continent. I appeal to any right-minded Englishman to know, if he can discover anything in the condition and principles of the South to warrant the hope, or even the desire, that any alliance could, or ought to, exist between free England and the Slave Confederacy? The same antagonism which has existed between the two sections of our country, love of slavery in one, and love of liberty in the other, and which has at last terminated in its natural consequence, *War*, can only produce similar results elsewhere, and always. To be in alliance with the South, to carry on for any time even commercial relations only with her, England will have either to submit to the necessary and consistent demands and exactions of the slavery interest, as the Free States have done, or be compelled at last, as have these, to take up arms in defence of law and justice. There can be no lasting peace or friendship between *light* and *darkness*, between *right* and *wrong*, between *God* and *Mammon*.

And now as to—

## II.—THE CAUSES OF THE REBELLION.

Those who have reflected upon the history and interests of the Slave States and the Free States, respectively, need scarcely be told what the true causes of the Southern rebellion are. But, to accomplish certain purposes, the real cause has been ignored, and false motives have been adduced. Southerners have known very well that they could not hope to gain favour to their rebellion, in England, if they boldly avowed there, that only *the necessities of slavery* compelled them to assert their independence; and the English advocates of Southern independence would not venture to support them on this ground. Consequently, a variety of ingeniously-invented reasons have been assigned for the rebellion, on the part of the South, such as *Differences in the character of the people of the two sections of the country, from colonial times to the present day; A system of tariffs enforced by the North upon the South; Refusal on the part of the North to carry out the provisions of the Constitution in favour of the South, &c. &c.* The last assertion has already been sufficiently disproved.

1. Whatever may have been, or may be, the differences as to origin, character, &c., between the inhabitants of the Slave and Free States, they have never led to any discordance of action, excepting when the one question of slavery has been involved. We have waged war together against other nations (and against our common parent, when colonial idiosyncrasies were much more strongly

marked than they have been since); Northern ingenuity, enterprise, and capital have been freely lent to and freely borrowed by the South; Southerners have come to the North for education, enjoyment, and health; and all the elegancies and comforts of Southern homes are of Northern, when not of foreign, origin. Every one knows, too, that the Northern population is much more heterogeneous than the Southern; yet this leads to no civil conflicts. And is the United States made up of populations more dissimilar than the Irish, Scotch, Welsh, and English who compose "*the United Kingdom?*" Or are we more diversely mixed, as regards North and South, than the Swiss Republic, with its Italian, German, French, and Swiss populations, with their different and antagonistic religions, and separate languages?

2. The *Tariff* theory of the rebellion was invented for the European, and especially for the English, market, and it is utterly untenable.

In the first place, Southern influence has been predominant in the national Congress for the last half century, and if the South had at any time really desired to do away with the tariff system, it could easily have done so. And admitting that the industry of the South is chiefly agricultural, it is not more so than that of the Western States; neither is a free-trade policy more for the interest of the South than it would probably be for the State of New York, which is more immediately engaged in commerce. But neither the West nor New York has ever threatened Secession on account of the tariff system.

In the history of the tariff policy of the United States there are two periods, viz., first, when *protection* to domestic industry and native resources was aimed at, and, later, when only *the collection of revenue* was desired.

In the first Session of the House of Representatives, after the adoption of the Constitution, the first measure proposed was one imposing duties on foreign commerce "for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures."—(Story, "*The American Question*," p. 18.) The Southern members generally voted for the measure, and it was passed, Mr. Madison, a Virginian, being the Leader of the House.

In 1816, a new Bill was proposed by Mr. Calhoun himself, the Leader of the Southern party, and supported by two-fifths of the Southern representatives. It was avowedly a *protective* measure, levying a duty on coarse cotton goods as high as 60 and 80 per cent.—(Story, *op. cit.*; Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 95.)

In 1824, however, the South, although possessing within itself all natural advantages for establishing manufacturing interests, including the great cotton staple, had already become convinced that

the character of her population and the peculiarity of her labour-system, rendered it impossible for her ever to become anything beyond a mere producer of "raw material" for other manufacturing communities.—(See Mr. Benton's—himself a slaveholder—account of this change of policy, quoted by Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 123.) Hence a *portion* of the Slave States began to oppose a protective tariff. At this period *the New England States* were also averse to such protection, and in conjunction with Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, voted against the Tariff Law of 1824; it was advocated, however, and passed by the *Slave States* of Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, Missouri, Tennessee, and scattering votes from others, together with New York, and the grain-growing Free States, all led by Mr. Clay, a slaveholder. And after this, *the New England States*, seeing that the country generally seemed favourable to a protective tariff, instead of threatening to separate from the Union, wisely directed their capital and ingenious industry to manufactures.

In 1832, South Carolina, no longer satisfied with constitutional opposition to the Tariff policy of the country, *nullified* the laws of Congress on this question; but she was not supported by her sister Slave States, and her attempt at secession was put down by the honest and determined action of President Jackson, a slaveholder. Then Mr. Calhoun, seeing the impossibility of uniting the Slave States on the Tariff policy, as a common ground, and determined to make everything of patriotism and Constitutional obligation yield to the exigencies of slavery, declared that henceforth the South must shift her basis of united action to the question of slavery.—(Benton, quoted by Mr. Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 148.)

Subsequently, in 1842, the most protective tariff that was ever enacted, was voted for by a majority of Southern Congressmen, and ratified by President Tyler, a Southern presidential "*accident*."—(Story, *op. cit.*) And when, in 1846, an effort was made to repeal that law, amongst those Southerners who voted to *sustain it* were Mr. Stephens, actual Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, and Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, now in command somewhere at the South; the Bill was voted *for* by 50 Northern and 64 Southern, and *against* by 73 Northern and only 22 Southern Congressmen. In like manner, the Tariff Bill of 1857 was *supported* by 60 Northern and 63 Southern votes, and *opposed* by 65 Northern and only 7 Southern votes. "This last, emphatically a Southern tariff, imposes a protective duty on rice for South Carolina, and on Sugar for Louisiana, one of 15, the other of 25, per cent.—(Ludlow, *op. cit.*, p. 307.)

"*The abominable Morrill Tariff*" was an exceptional measure in every way. So far from occasioning Secession, it was itself a consequence of Secession, for it could not have been passed if the

Southerners had retained their places in Congress ; and the fact that a civil war was seen to be impending, which would require vast expenditures on the part of the Government, gained it support from those who otherwise would have opposed it. And even this "*infamous Morrill Tariff*" is less exclusive as to most articles than the present French Tariff, which has given so much satisfaction and profit to England, as well as to France.

Vice-President Stephens, in his speech before the Georgia Legislature, in which he opposed the plan of Secession (Nov. 14th, 1860), said, with reference to the tariff grievance, "When I entered public life in 1832, South Carolina threatened to leave the Union on the tariff question ; but the difficulty was smoothed down, and we have not had, since 1833, on the tariff question, any cause of complaint. The present tariff (of 1857) was voted for by South Carolina as well as by Massachusetts. It is, therefore, untrue to say that the South is obliged to pay arbitrary duties imposed by the North, since the Representatives of Massachusetts were unanimous in modifying these duties as the South desired." And he stated, what must strike as being true every one who reflects upon the real interests of the South, that "*the disappointment of ambitious aspirants to office has had much to do with bringing on this deplorable state of our affairs.*"

Thus a tariff for high protection was originally a Southern policy, established in opposition to Northern interests ; and a tariff for revenue has always been advocated by the South—indeed, has been opposed by more Northern votes than Southern.

And the reason why the Slave States have always advocated this latter form of tariff is obvious, viz., that, *in consequence thereof, they have always been taxed less* than by any other possible method by which the Government could have collected revenues necessary for its support. If there had been no duties on imported merchandise, *direct taxation* would have been necessary, and a direct taxation based, according to the Constitution, not only upon the white population of the South, but upon three-fifths of its blacks, which burthen would have fallen chiefly upon the slaveholders, not only for their slaves, but also for the millions of poor whites, who have nothing to pay taxes with. Indeed, the unpopularity of such a tax, levied upon the slaves, (to be paid by their owners,) was shown in the fact, that, when it was ordered by the Southern Congress, or State Legislatures, or both, subsequent to Secession, it was resisted and could not be enforced. On the other hand, under the operation of the Tariff Laws, the South has been obliged to pay only just that amount of *indirect taxation* which it pleased,—according to the aggregate of foreign merchandise *which it chose to make use of* ; and inasmuch as the Southern population is of such a character as to create but a small demand for foreign articles,—the coarse

cottons and woollens needed for the slaves and the poor whites being made cheaper at the North than they can be made in Europe,—the Slave States have really contributed *but a comparatively small quota to the revenues of the Government, less than one-fourth*, according to Vice-President Stephens.—(Speech before the Georgia Legislature, Nov. 14th, 1860.) Consequently, if there has been any oppression at all created by the Tariff Laws of the United States, the oppression has been borne, and willingly borne, *by the people of the Free States*, who have consumed by far the larger part of the foreign wares upon which these laws have operated.

3. No, the only cause for the rebellion alleged in America is, *the interests of slavery*, and the growing opposition to this “peculiar institution,” on the part of the Free States. This fact is amply proved by the statements of Southerners themselves.

All the secession ordinances passed in the seceding States to justify their rebellion, set forth this as the cause, and only this.

The Hon. L. W. Spratt, of South Carolina, in his paper on “*The Philosophy of Secession*,” published after the fact, says, “The contest is not between the North and South as geographical sections, for between such sections merely there can be no contest; nor between the people of the North and the people of the South, for our relations have been pleasant, and on neutral grounds there is still nothing to estrange us. *The real contest is between the two forms of society* which have become established, the one at the North and the other at the South. The one is a society composed of one race, the other of two races. The one is bound together but by the two great social relations of husband and wife and parent and child; the other by the three relations of husband and wife, parent and child, and master and slave. Such, then, being the nature of the contest, *this Union has been disrupted in the effort of slave society to emancipate itself*.”—(Cairnes’ “*Lecture on the Revolution in America*,” pp. 8, 9.) And the Vice-President of the Confederacy, who may be supposed to know the why and wherefore of Secession, declared in his now celebrated speech, after the new Constitution was promulgated, “The new Constitution has for ever ended all agitation relative to our peculiar institution—I mean slavery as it exists among us. *This question has been the immediate cause of the rupture, and of the present revolution*.” And it is worthy of note, that the Constitution expressly chosen for the Southern Confederacy is almost identical with that of the United States. The chief differences between the two instruments are that, in the Southern, slavery is regularly established, and its interests formally provided for, both for its maintenance *and its extension*, and that the new Constitution is avowedly a compact or league between sovereign and independent States, and not a bond of Union, “ordained and established by the People.” These departures from

the Federal Constitution do virtually sanction the admission that these principles have no existence or recognition therein.

As to the rebellion, therefore, it is useless to pretend to say, as has been done even lately in England, that slavery was not the one and exclusive cause of it; or still more absurdly, as has been within six months asserted in the British Parliament, that it has had little or nothing to do with it.

### III.—THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE REBELLION.

We have traced the history of slavery from the first importation of negroes in 1620 down to the election of Mr. Lincoln as President of the United States in 1860. During this lapse of nearly two and a-half centuries, the negro population, increased partly by successive importations from Africa, had augmented to *four millions of slaves, and about half a million of free blacks.*

We have seen that rebellion, under the mask of Secession, was threatened in 1856, in apprehension of the election of Mr. Fremont; but it was actually accomplished in 1860. Not that the South had the slightest reason to apprehend that Mr. Lincoln, or the Republican party which elected him, had the least intention or desire to interfere with the *rights* of the Slave States under the constitutional guarantees in favour of slavery. We have the most abundant testimony as to this. Thus, the most violent pro-slavery men of South Carolina admitted, in the Convention of that State, that "Secession was not produced by the election of Mr. Lincoln, nor by the non-execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, but that it had been preparing for a long series of years." And the Vice-President of the Confederacy solemnly assured the Legislature and people of Georgia, that "the rights of the South had been and could still be secured in the Union." He said, "I am not one of those who believe that the Union has been injurious to us. Where will you find in Europe, Asia, or America, a Government which has at all times and under all circumstances respected more, and more effectively protected, the liberties of the people? I will even say, that I think we have too much liberty, and too great an abundance of blessings, of which we are unworthy."—(Bigelow, *op. cit.*, p. 142.) And later still, even in the Confederate Congress, Mr. Hill, of Georgia, declared, "The people of the South never dissolved the Union on account of complaints against the Federal Government."—(Baltimore "*American*," October 14th, 1862.)

Mr. Lincoln and the Republican party had repeatedly and solemnly declared their intention to abide by all the provisions of the Constitution in favour of slavery. They were willing, indeed, *in order to ensure peace*, that a fresh constitutional guarantee should

be enacted, so that slavery never could be interfered with in *the States*, save by State legislation. But *they would not consent* to its introduction into the *territories* of the Republic, and the South would accept of nothing less than this.—(See an Extract from the speech of ex-Governor Moorehead, of Kentucky, delivered in England, and quoted in Professor Cairnes' "*Lecture.*")

The leaders of the extreme Southern party were consistent and determined, and, it must also be admitted, unscrupulous. They knew that to limit slavery within certain territorial boundaries, however wide those limits might be, was, in the end, to ensure its extinction; and they preferred that it should be extinguished after a blaze of patriotic glory, (if then!) rather than by a slow process of suffocation. They preferred war. And to prepare for it, they availed themselves of all the opportunities which their supremacy in the Government, under Mr. Buchanan's administration, placed within their reach. It is a disgraceful history, but it is a true one, that Secretaries of the Cabinet, probably the President himself, Members of Congress, Governors of States, Officers of the Army and Navy,—all of whom had bound themselves by solemn oath to uphold the Federal Constitution, "anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding,"—deliberately plotted the violation of that Constitution. Under their management, or that of some of them, the Treasury was left in a condition worse than empty; the arsenals, forts, and magazines belonging to the Government, but situated in the Northern States, were stripped of their contents to enrich those at the South, which were left so ungarrisoned as to be easily taken; the naval forces of the country were scattered on remote cruising stations, so as to be out of reach when the Government should most need them; the small army of the United States was broken up over a remote frontier line; and finally the war was begun by the South with the attack on the United States forts in Charleston harbour, after custom-houses, post-offices, and arsenals had been seized.

But, we are told, if the South was really determined to leave the Union, why was she not permitted to go in peace? The Free States would have been left with a domain large enough to satisfy several European nations, and with resources, capacities for self-government, and a grade of civilization, far superior to those of the South; and the drag and guilt and stigma of slavery removed, the United States would have attained to a position far higher than that which they have yet reached. Why did the Free States and the Federal Government resist?

Because, in the first place, no nation willingly submits to dismemberment. Englishmen, who so freely counsel us to do so, have always shown, themselves, a preference for fighting rather than for yielding to such demands. And would not the quiet submission to



such a rebellion against the Constitution and the Union have completely falsified our boasts of attachment and reverence to and for them? It is far better for a nation to fight manfully, in a just cause, for what it does and ought to prize, than to submit to insult and robbery. And, moreover, every line of division which can be devised is open to a thousand insuperable objections, which only necessity would reconcile us to. They all pre-suppose large standing armies, hosts of customs officials scattered along an internal frontier of thousands of miles, constant border troubles from lawless raids and fugitive slaves, and the thousand and one difficulties every day occurring between Continental States, aggravated in our case by the recent hostilities in which we have been engaged. The mere question of the navigation of the Mississippi would be an almost insoluble difficulty. It is useless to pretend that this could be settled by treaty. If the Constitution solemnly ratified and sworn to, and the conviction of immense benefits derived from it; if repeated "compromise measures," understood, at least by one party, to be perpetually binding; if the certainty of dreadful evils to be incurred, in the event of a civil war; if the recollections of a common history, of trials endured and successes achieved in common,—if all these combined were not sufficient to enable us to live together in peace, is it supposable that any amount of common treaty-swearing will prevent hostilities between us when we shall be independent of each other, and avowed rivals, fresh from mutual slaughter?

### PRETENDED RIGHT OF SECESSION.

Again, who was to authorize, or sanction, or allow, the peaceable rupture of the Union? The President, Congress, the Judiciary, all the officials of the Government, were bound by solemn oath to support the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, and which neither admits nor contemplates the *right* of a State to violate that law by secession, or in any other way. What has "*Secession*" been, what was it at the moment of its conception and subsequent birth, but violation of obligation and allegiance to the supreme law of the land, terminating in armed and aggressive hostility? No functionary in the Government of the United States, from the President downwards, nor all of them combined, had the right to sanction such a wrong.

Once admit the principle involved, that a State has a reserved right to break away from her constitutional allegiance to the Union, and all stability is taken from Government. Even successful rebellion against the armed power of the Sovereign State weakens the principles of allegiance in other subjects; unopposed rebellion destroys it altogether, in fact, it is a virtual abandonment of Sovereignty.

Under this interpretation of the Constitution, to-day we may constitute one nation, to-morrow a dozen.

The history of the formation of the Federal Constitution proves, that it was precisely for the purpose of establishing a Government which should be really sovereign over the States, that the old "*Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union*" between the original States of the Confederation were given up.

By these "*Articles*," adopted in 1777, almost all the attributes of *sovereignty* were expressly reserved to the individual States, the Government of the Confederation being left a sort of residuary legatee, and it was soon found that the latter possessed no right nor power to govern; it could suggest and consult with the States, but it could not command them, or it could not enforce its orders. Consequently, a Convention of Delegates from the different States was held in 1787, which drew up a new instrument, the actual "*Federal Constitution*." This was submitted not to the *States*, but to the *People* themselves, (in Conventions,) from whom the States derived their own existence; and this *Sovereign People* did "*ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America*."

The preamble of this Constitution expressly declares, "We, the People of the United States, in order to form a *more perfect union*, do ordain and establish this Constitution," &c.; "more perfect" than what? more perfect than the old "*Articles of Confederation*," which themselves were intended to constitute a "*perpetual union*."

By this Constitution, all the powers and attributes which constitute *sovereignty* are expressly and by name taken away from the individual States and centred in itself, and by it delegated to the President, the Congress, &c., of the United States. And to make doubly certain which was intended to be the sovereign and which the subject, the Constitution expressly declares, "No State shall" possess or exercise this, that, and the other attribute of sovereignty. And it solemnly enjoins that "*This Constitution*, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be *the supreme law of the land*"; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The Senators and representatives before mentioned, (of the United States,) and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

Among the rights and attributes of sovereignty which the Constitution declares "*no State shall*" possess or exercise, is that, to "*enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation*;" and among

those which it confers upon Congress is that, "to provide for the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, to *suppress insurrections*, and repel invasions."

Now, "*Secession*" is manifestly but a mild synonyme for *insurrection*; and it is ridiculous to pretend that "the Constitution of the United States" *allows* of insurrection, when it *expressly imposes upon Congress the duty of levying forces "to suppress insurrections."*

Southerners, even of South Carolina, previous to Mr. Calhoun, and many at this day, have never pretended that the Constitution *authorized* separation. Mr. Jefferson *opposed* the acceptance of the Constitution on the very ground that it swallowed up State rights,—making a consolidated Government, constituting a nation. Patrick Henry made the same *objection* to it, saying of it, "That the Government is a consolidated Government is perfectly evident; the Constitution says, '*We, the People*,' not *We, the States*." Mr. Pinckney *approved* of it, for this very reason, declaring in the South Carolina Convention, "This admirable Manifesto sufficiently refutes the doctrine of the individual sovereignty and independence of the States." The Supreme Court, in 1788, decided, comparing the new "Constitution" with the old "Articles of Confederation" between the States, "*These allied sovereignties have changed their league into a Government, and their Congress of Ambassadors into a Legislature.*" And through a long series of decisions since, the Supreme Court of the United States, the judicial interpreter of the Constitution, has never sanctioned the modern Southern idea of the supremacy of the States over the Constitution. The Supreme District Court of South Carolina, even in the very heat of the Nullification Season, 1832, 1833, in a case involving a question of supremacy of the United States over some South Carolina troops or officers, decided in favour of the former. (This case was argued, in favour of the United States, by Mr. Pettigrew, of South Carolina, recently dead; up to the last he had always been loyal to the Federal Government, refusing to take an oath of allegiance to the new order of things. When the Clergyman first read the newly-appointed prayer for Jefferson Davis in church, Mr. Pettigrew walked out.)

But even if it were true that the *original thirteen States* which constituted *the United States*, by the adoption of the Federal Constitution, did reserve to themselves certain rights, one of which (although they took precious good care to say nothing about it!) was the right to quit the Union whenever it should suit them so to do, the same cannot be said of *the new States* which have been formed since, out of territories acquired by purchase and otherwise for and by the people of the whole Union, as represented by the Government. The settlers of the present States of Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, &c., were permitted by

the Federal Government to occupy land within those States, at that time territories governed by Congress, under the Constitution. When their population had become sufficiently numerous, these territories, one after another, were admitted into the Union as States, each one submitting its Constitution to Congress for sanction. These States, therefore, never possessed any rights which they did not acquire under the authorization and sanction of the Federal Constitution and the Federal Government; and surely no one can pretend that one of these rights could have been that of violating that Constitution and subverting that Government. Yet the States of Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, now in the Southern Confederacy, can claim the right of peaceable Secession on no other ground.

Therefore it is evident that no such right as *Secession*, or, in plain English, *revolt*, *insurrection*, *revolution*, can be claimed *under the Constitution*. Every people has the right of revolution, but it does not get this right *from the Government to which it owes allegiance*. This right of revolution comes from obligations of the Government to the people, violated; from oppression, persisted in; from natural rights, unacknowledged and disregarded. All the English revolutions, and our Revolution of 1776, are justifiable on these grounds. But the South has no such grievances to plead. If it had *any*, the Constitution itself provides the mode in which redress is to be sought for and gained; and the world knows sufficiently well the influence which the South has always exercised in the United States, to be persuaded that any grievance which it could have established to be such would have been promptly and fully redressed by constitutional means.

### SECESSION NOT THE GENERAL DESIRE AT THE SOUTH.

There is another reason why the Federal Government was bound to oppose the Secession movement. The Government had the best evidence that, in spite of all the usual and extraordinary means employed to gain an overwhelming vote in favour of the ultra-Southern candidate for the Presidency, and of extreme pro-slavery schemes,—in spite of intimidations, forced expatriation of known or suspected Unionists,—in spite of the temptation presented to Southern debtors, by State and Confederate laws absolving them from their pecuniary obligations to Northern merchants and capitalists, amounting to \$300,000,000, ("Revue des deux Mondes," December, 1860; "Annuaire des deux Mondes," 1860,)—there was a strong, if not predominating, feeling throughout the South in favour of the Union. Thus, Mr. Breckenridge, the extreme Southern candidate, received in

all the Slave States, in 1860, 436,592 votes; the other candidates, who were all avowed Unionists, holding somewhat different views as to the relation of slavery to the public territories, received 419,932 votes. And if it could have been foreseen that a civil war would follow as a result of this election, there can be no doubt whatever, from the opposition which the first Secession steps met with in Conventions, amongst the people, and from the Southern press, there can be no doubt but that the Union vote would have been immensely in the majority. In *Virginia*, it was 92,900, against 74,323; in *Tennessee*, 80,624, against 64,709; even in *Georgia*, 54,476, against 51,889; in *Louisiana*, 27,829, against 22,681.

The question of actual Secession was, in few if any of the States, submitted to Conventions chosen expressly to decide upon it, but to the ordinary Legislatures assembled for very different purposes. Even in these bodies there was, in every case, strong opposition made to disunion. Even in the *South Carolina* Assembly, Mr. Boyce declared, "If Secession shall take place, of which I have no idea, for I cannot believe in *such stupendous madness*, I shall consider the institution of slavery as doomed, and that the great God, in our blindness, has made us the instrument of its destruction." The "*Raleigh Standard*," North Carolina, exposed to the public "the fearful evils that must result from Secession,—repudiation, bankruptcy, beggary, the predominance of the sword over law, and *the end will be abolition*."—(Story, *op. cit.*; "*Annuaire des deux Mondes*," 1860, pp. 607-625; Ellison, p. 67.) Now, the duties and obligations of Government and people are reciprocal and mutual; and the Federal Government was bound to resist Secession, and to protect all loyal citizens in the Slave States against the attempts of unscrupulous men and parties to force them from their allegiance. The war once commenced, there is nothing, *manifestly nothing*, for the Federal Government to do, excepting to *fight until the revolution shall be crushed, or until itself shall be overcome*. This it is bound to do, from considerations of the respect due to it, as a sovereign power, by its own subjects, and by foreign States; by the certainty that the principle of its supremacy, not only over the States actually in revolt, but over those which are now loyal, is at stake, at the present moment, and for the future; by its obligations to maintain over all the land the right of the whole nation to property acquired for the benefit of all; by its sacred duty to *humanity, outraged* in this monstrous attempt to establish a right to oppress.

We have now to consider another important division of the subject, viz. :—

IV. The policy and position of the Federal Government and the people of the Free States towards slavery and the negroes; and the War.

## THE OBJECTS OF THE WAR, ON THE PART OF THE FREE STATES.

The English Foreign Secretary of State declared, early in the contest, that the North was fighting for supremacy, and the South for independence. And so it is, or rather, so it *was*, for the scope of the war has become wider since his lordship uttered his now celebrated observation. "*The North is fighting for supremacy*," but it is for the supremacy of that Constitution which all—Slave States and Free States—had sworn to uphold and obey; for the supremacy of that Union which, as the Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy himself admitted, "was known to the people of the South only by the protection it has afforded them, the blessings it has conveyed to them, and the prosperity which it has enabled them to attain;" for the supremacy of equal laws, equal rights, equal privileges.

"*The South, too, is fighting for independence*," but it is for independence of all restraint upon the permanence and extension of slavery, *for freedom to enslave*.

Very many Englishmen, even those who are friendly to the United States, and who abhor slavery, (as I have *no doubt* the vast majority of Englishmen do,) have been misled in their judgment and appreciation of the sentiment of the people of the Free States with regard to slavery, and of the policy of the Federal Government, by overlooking, or underrating, the fact that the Federal Constitution authorized the existence of slavery in the States. Consequently, the people and the Government *were bound* to allow it to continue there, so long as the Constitution remained unaltered. Moreover, *in order to avoid disunion and civil war*, threatened from time to time by the South, the Free States made certain *Compromises*, which they themselves regarded as binding, by which they hoped to secure certain territories of the country from the encroachments of slavery for ever. By so doing they allowed the *spirit* of the Constitution to be completely changed. For, as we have seen, slavery was merely *tolerated* by the Constitution as an evil which was existing, but which, as the framers of the Constitution hoped and believed, would soon expire. But, instead of dying, the institution has gone on day by day gaining new strength, until, at last, a blind Samson, it has pulled down upon our heads the temple in which we worshipped. Up to the commencement of the rebellion, the Government and the people of the Free States were fettered by the Constitution. And even after the war had begun we were not free from those fetters, so far as the Slave States which remained loyal to the Constitution were concerned; the constitutional provisions in favour of slavery still existed as regards these States, and we were still bound to abide by them. We were

waging war to maintain the Constitution against traitors who were striving to murder it ; we could not, with any propriety, while we struck down these traitors, stab the Constitution ourselves. And, moreover, so long as there remained any hope that the rebellious States would return to their allegiance, we were willing to retain these constitutional provisions, as an inducement for them to return, and also as a guarantee of honesty of purpose towards the Slave States which remained loyal. Hence, in the beginning, the maintenance of the supremacy of the Constitution and the Union were the objects of the war.

But, thanks to the persistence of the rebellion, we were at last freed from the trammels which had long been made to bind only one of the parties to the constitutional compact. The sword has at last cut the knot which philanthropists have been unable to untie, and which politicians had only drawn the tighter.

The North is *now* fighting to restore wholly to the Constitution the spirit of liberty of which it had been, in part, robbed, by the power and "*greed*" of the slavery interest. The intention of the Constitution, originally, was to secure, literally, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves and our posterity," to all indiscriminately, without distinction of race or colour. The great men who framed it hated slavery. The Constitution itself was so ashamed of the system, that it did not pollute itself by the insertion of the word *slave* or *slavery*. The North is now fighting that the supremacy of this Constitution, regenerated, shall be re-established over all the land, and that slavery, throughout its length and breadth, shall cease for ever.

It is true that, when the war broke upon us, the *abolitionists* in the Free States were so few, that we could almost name them all ; but that little leaven has leavened the whole lump. I judge of others by the change which has come over myself. When the war began, I was not an abolitionist, nor ever had been. I admitted that slavery was an evil, as did every one at the North, and felt that it should have been done away with when, after the revolutionary war, we started on the great race of freedom. But, little by little, the system had attained to such proportions, and had become so inwoven with our political existence, that we feared to touch the disease lest the very life of the body should be removed with it. We dreaded civil war ; we dreaded to let loose four millions of slaves amidst our Southern brethren, for whom we entertained a sincere regard, and for whom we now feel, as Mrs. Stowe says, "*An immense pity.*" But after they themselves had determined that the whole land should become a slave land, or be deluged with the horrors of a civil war, I became an abolitionist, and I confess I do not see how any one in the Free States can be anything else.

Those few *abolitionists* at the North, Garrison and Gerritt Smith

and Sumner, and such as they, were the only far-seeing men and true patriots we had. I honour them now, as I disliked them once, as being "*pestilent fellows*," and *men of one idea*. But all men who accomplish great reformatations must be *pestilent fellows* to the public of their day, until their work has been accomplished; then their worth is recognised. Such men must be men of "*one idea*;" this one idea they must carry about with them at all times; they must make it a living, moving idea; they must incessantly kindle it afresh from their own glowing souls into a new life, or it will die in the uncongenial atmosphere in which they move. Thus it was with *Howard*, and *Wilberforce*, and *Father Matthew*; thus it was, and still is, with our own *Miss Dix*, who, wherever she goes—and where has she not journeyed, over America and Europe?—carries with her the one idea of *mercy* to the prisoner, the sick, and the insane; thus it was with *John Knox*, and *Calvin*, and *Luther*; thus it was with *Peter the Hermit*; thus it was with St. Paul, with his "this *One* thing I do." People always call such men *fanatics*; *they must be fanatics*, or they will accomplish nothing in the face of the opposition which besets them. And so the early abolitionists of the Free States of America were *fanatics*; but they are the *regenerators of America, the Fathers of the second American Independence*.

An eloquent and liberal Frenchman, Count Gasparin, well described the people of the Free States, at the outbreak of the war, as, "*un grande peuple qui se relève*." It was indeed a re-awakening, a resurrection, from a moral stupor, almost death, into which that people had been *drugged*. It was a bursting asunder of all mercenary and corrupt bands in which the slavery interest had held them. And in this uprising, there was nothing *revolutionary*, no desire or purpose to trespass upon the constitutional rights of the South. So far as slavery is concerned, the only design of the Republican party was (in the language of the actual Vice-President of the Southern Confederacy, who, it must be confessed, has been one of our *best friends*, inasmuch as he has enabled us to prove unmistakably the real principles involved in the war,) "*to exclude slavery, by Acts of Congress, from the public territories, and to oppose the extension of slavery in every way*."—(Speech of Mr. Stephens, at Milledgeville, Georgia, *ten days after the election of Mr. Lincoln*, quoted by Bigelow, *op. cit.*, p. 143.) But, however misunderstood and, by certain parties, wilfully misrepresented in *England*, the policy of the Free States and the Federal Government may have been, *the South* made no mistake on the subject; the South understood well and justly that, to place any, however remote, limits to the extension of slavery, is really "the beginning of the end" of the institution. This is admitted in a work entitled "*The South Vindicated*," by the Hon. James Williams, who says, "It is not to be supposed that the object of the great body of Americans



who enlisted in this conflict (the anti-slavery) was, primarily, to achieve a triumph of their policy in the Republic; yet such would be the effect of a successful effort to impair by degrees, and finally to destroy, the institution of slavery in the Southern American States." The gradual and rapid exhaustion of the land, the rapid multiplication of the slaves, their increasing price, and the enhancing cost of supporting them, all these circumstances would certainly, and not slowly, bring about the time when "both master and slave would be starved out," as judge Warner, of Georgia, acknowledged.

#### THE ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE OF THE *FREE STATES* WITH REFERENCE TO SLAVERY.

Thus the aim of the Republican party was a very modest one. But ever since the outbreak of the contest in America, occurrences and principles have marched more rapidly than men; and he must be blind who does not see that an Omnipotent hand has shaped the future for us, and hurled forward events so rapidly, that politicians have been unable to overtake and obstruct them in their course. Thus, the Republicans arrived at power expecting to have to fight almost for their existence with the Southern party, and its democratic allies in Congress; but they found the seats of Southern members vacant; the war was begun, and the Democrats, *nolens volens*, were compelled, for decency's sake, to fight against their ancient friends, and the Republican party has had the opportunity of exhibiting to the world what the real sentiment of the Free States is and has been with regard to slavery. And now what has been done since Mr. Lincoln became President?

1. Slavery has been abolished in the district of Columbia, and the masters compensated for their slaves thus freed.

2. Slavery has been abolished in and excluded from all the actual and possible territories of the United States, "in order that freedom shall be the natural inheritance of the inhabitants thereof for ever."

3. The national treasury has been pledged to assist all Slave States which shall enact emancipation laws to take effect within a certain time. This measure originated with Mr. Lincoln.

4. Permission has been granted to Great Britain to search all vessels bearing the United States flag suspected of being engaged in the slave-trade.

5. A new and unmistakable sanction has been given to our laws against the slave-trade, by the execution of a convicted slave-trader.

6. The free black Republics of Hayti and Liberia have been

acknowledged, and Ambassadors exchanged between them and the United States.

All these measures fell within the legitimate scope of Congressional legislation, and, taken in connexion with the mere success of the Republican party, they constitute a continuous chain of evidence, a complete body of proof, which no candid person can break or gainsay, in favour of the strength and sincerity of the opposition of the Free States and the Federal Government to the institution of slavery.

These laws left slavery untouched in the *States* where it was allowed by the Constitution. But the rebellion of most of these States itself cut through this constitutional guarantee. The Federal Government was thenceforth empowered to leave this proslavery provision, so far as the rebellious States were concerned, precisely where these States themselves left it, viz., *in the past*, and to carry out that other duty, "*to suppress insurrection*," which the Constitution still binds it to perform. Hence the *Emancipation Proclamation* of the President was issued, avowedly as a *military measure*, and only on this ground was it justifiable. But on this ground it is abundantly justifiable. For the Southern Confederacy, though inferior to the Free States in white population, has been able to send to the war a sufficiently large force of whites to prevent, as yet, the success of the Federal Government, partly because the former is acting on the defensive; partly because the mass of the whites who compose the Southern army have never been of any use at home, and never could be made available for any other purpose than for fighting; partly because the requirements of Southern civilization are so low, as compared with that of the Free States, that the whole white population can be spared from the ordinary pursuits of peaceful life; and, finally, because the slave-population has been made use of to supply the army with all that the country can furnish for its subsistence, and also to perform for it certain field-labours which the whites would be unwilling to do, or could not well be spared to do, for themselves. It was intended, therefore, that the Proclamation should aid in suppressing the rebellion by creating a sense of insecurity and danger in the rear of the rebellion at home, and thus cause a diversion from the front of the Federal troops. But it was also intended to be, and does constitute, *the complement, the crowning measure* of legislation in favour of the abolition of slavery.

It has been objected to the Proclamation that it left slavery still existing in the Border Slave States, and in certain parts of the others, where alone it could have been at once abolished, while it professed to do away with the institution only where itself would be inoperative. But the objection is a very shallow one, and very unfair. For, in the first place, it could not lawfully be applied to

the Border States which remained loyal, because these were covered by the Constitution; and secondly, the emancipation of the slaves, in these States, was already provided for by the operation of the Compensation Law of Congress. And that this law is not and will not be "*a dead letter*," is already established. For the *State of Missouri*, with her 115,000 slaves, has already acknowledged the necessity of emancipation, and her Legislature has begun to discuss a plan for accomplishing it. The Legislature of *Western Virginia* has already passed an emancipation law. In *Delaware* and *Maryland*, similar measures are in preparation, and will be adopted. And all the Slave States which remain in the Union, and all which may hereafter return, or be re-conquered, must become Free States. And they will find in the increased value of land, in the vastly-improved condition and *worth* of the population, white and black, and in the growing progress of the States, abundant proof of the wisdom of their emancipation laws in a material point of view.

Several other objections have been made to the Emancipation Proclamation. Thus it is said to be a most barbarous measure, which will endanger, if it do not directly occasion, an armed servile insurrection; but in the next moment the same objector declares that the Proclamation is a dead letter, that it will only reach those slaves who cannot rebel, being surrounded by United States troops. Again, it is said that the Proclamation was designed not to benefit the slaves, but to injure the masters. Now, it is obvious that, if the slaves be so much attached to their masters as these pretend, they will have no desire to injure them; and if the Proclamation shall only reach those who cannot rebel, these will have no power to injure.

The truth is, that *a servile insurrection is possible*, though not probable. It is much more likely that the whites "of the baser sort" will murder the blacks than that these will massacre their masters. This has always been avowed by the South, and has recently been officially announced by Mr. Davis himself. The President of the United States has taken every precaution to prevent such a catastrophe either on the part of the slaves or their masters; and our British friends may be assured that precautions will continue to be taken. But if such a catastrophe as an armed servile insurrection should occur, and the blacks, in self-defence or otherwise, revenge upon their oppressors the accumulated wrongs of more than two centuries, the masters will have only themselves to blame, and their criminal and insane ambition which has brought this war upon their country. The South has been warned of this very danger by their own politicians. The President, long before the Proclamation was determined upon, admonished the South that the continuance of the rebellion would render such a measure necessary; and after it was prepared, he suspended it over the land, like the

sword hung up in the sky, which presaged to Jerusalem the coming of Titus.

The policy of the Federal Government concerning slavery was misunderstood, at first, in England ; but when afterwards explained, and satisfactorily to every one who was willing to be satisfied, it was misrepresented. The very men, the very journals, who, at the commencement of the war, most loudly urged the Government to abolish slavery, and who have since declared that no Englishman could have any sympathy with the North, because abolition was not talked of, (yet who, all the while, have been favouring and encouraging the South, which is avowedly fighting to perpetuate slavery,) now abuse the Government, because, at last, emancipation has become one of the declared objects of the war. The President's letter to Horace Greeley is called "a most damning proof of his insincerity as to emancipation." And what was the purport of that letter? It simply set forth that as the President had sworn to uphold the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, it was his duty to observe that obligation, and to regard the maintenance, or the abolition, of slavery as secondary matters. If the Constitution could be enforced and slavery preserved where the Constitution allowed it, clearly the President was bound to let it remain ; if, however, in order to secure the supremacy of the Constitution, the institution of slavery, either wholly or in part, must be sacrificed, then, equally clearly, it would be the President's duty to act accordingly. But he could only then and there abolish slavery, after it should have become evident that its continued existence would be dangerous or fatal. And so he has fulfilled the spirit of the constitutional obligations. And it seems to me that, in view of the difficulties which have beset Mr. Lincoln's path, the dangers to be overcome, and the perils to be avoided ; considering the hostilities to which his administration has been exposed from bitter enemies without, and from false friends and traitors within, the punishment due to States in rebellion, and the consideration due to the loyal Slave States ; looking at the immense proportions which the war has assumed, and the utterly unprepared condition in which the Government and the Free States were when the war began :—I say, in view of all these and similar considerations, Mr. Lincoln and his administration are entitled to *immense praise* for the wise, consistent, liberal, and comprehensive policy which they inaugurated and have thus far successfully carried out.

It may suit the narrow minds and the illiberal principles of certain people, and the selfish national policy of certain political parties, in England, to ridicule Mr. Lincoln for his "low extraction" and his want of an elegant and refining education, and to denounce contemptuously the political institutions of America, that permit of the election of such a man to the Presidential office. But there are

thousands of people in the world equal to those men in birth and acquired advantages, and far superior to them in noble and generous principles and instincts; and there are millions to whom God has denied the former attributes, while He has given them the latter—there are millions, I say, who from their hearts thank God that there is a land where honesty of purpose, common-sense, industry, and perseverance, even without the accident of good birth or wealth, enable a man to obtain supreme power, and accomplish an *infinite* of good. And the name of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, *rail-splitter, bargee, country Attorney, Congressman, President of the United States, Emancipator of four millions of slaves*, will be honoured in history, when his detractors—polished *gentlemen*, crafty politicians,—will be forgotten, or remembered only to be damned.

### THE CONDITION OF THE FREE NEGROES

is held up to us as a reproach. But it ought not to suffice, in the face of all the evidence that has been accumulating during the last two years, to convince England that we are opposed to the abolition of slavery, or that we “hate” the free blacks. We might with far greater propriety accuse the British Government and people of having been opposed to Christianity in India, because, until the last few years, they subsidized Hindoo worship.

Improvement is progressive. Arouse a people to a keen perception, a sentiment, of their wrong-doing, and you have already begun to reform it. And so it will be with the condition of the free blacks in the United States. They spring from a race of slaves, and their complexion is an indelible and unmistakable evidence of their origin; but the *stigma* which has hitherto been associated with it is now being removed with the institution of slavery itself. Again, they are our servants, our hewers of wood and drawers of water, and their colour is associated with their occupation. They are not educated, although they have now the means of educating their children, so that the next generation of free blacks will be a considerable improvement over the present and the past. Great ignorance exists in England as to the real condition of the free blacks with us; you have heard of Frederick Douglass, as being an educated and eloquent Clergyman, and you fancy that he is a specimen of his class. But Frederick Douglass is a “*rara avis*,” and will probably always be so, just as Professor Owen is and will be a prodigy even in London. There is another fact which has operated prejudicially to the free blacks: they come into competition with the whites as labourers, and the selfishness of the whites, especially of the foreign whites, bears hardly upon them. But all these causes of disfavour are diminishing, and must continue to diminish. The consciousness of having dealt wrongfully by the black race will re-act in favour of the free negroes, as it has already done in favour of

the slaves ; the living presence amongst us of such men as Frederick Douglass will impress us, under this new condition, more than ever before, and will be an eloquent argument always pleading for his brethren ; the good conduct of the black troops whom the Government has wisely enrolled into its service will inspire the whites, all over the land, with respect ; the very debt which we have been rapidly augmenting will serve as a check upon immigration from Europe, and thus the labour of the free blacks will become more necessary, and will be subjected to less competition.

But what is really the condition of the negroes in the Free States ? In all the New England States, they vote just as white men vote ; in New York and Pennsylvania, they vote if they possess a certain property-qualification (and in this respect, even in those States, they are infinitely less oppressed than millions of industrious, honest, and intelligent British citizens in the United Kingdom) ; how they are situated as respects voting, in the Western States, I do not know, but probably as in these two last-named States. Moreover, they have their schools maintained at the public expense, so that, as we have seen, their children have greater advantages, as regards education, than even the children of the white population of the Slave States, and in Massachusetts their opportunities of improvement are similar to those of the inhabitants of Prussia, which has the best common-school system in Europe. They also have their churches and their Clergymen ; or if any of them choose to attend the public worship of the whites, they do so under no greater restrictions than English servants do in England, or on the Continent. They have all the rights and protection of person and property which the whites possess ; their oath is as much respected in Courts of Justice as that of a white gentleman ; and they occupy, in our cities and towns, such quarters as their means enable them to secure, without let or hindrance. *Per contra*,—and this seems to be the most shocking discredit to which they are subjected, in English estimation,—they are not allowed to ride in the same public conveyances as the whites ; but this is only true with respect to Philadelphia, and, to a much less degree, New York ; and the reason of the exclusion in these two cities is, simply that there is in them a large Southern element of population, which holds the free negro in contempt and disgust. Out of these two cities, all over the Free States, the free negro circulates freely with the whites in the public conveyances, occupying such places as he can pay for. On the railways of Pennsylvania, but I think not farther to the North, a special compartment is provided for negroes, and for the same reason as above stated. In fact, the nearer one approaches the Slave States, the more opprobrium is associated with the free negro. But this is not law ; it is a vulgar and irrational prejudice, and, like all such, will, sooner or later, vanish.

## FREE NEGROES AT THE SOUTH.

But compare the condition of the free negro in the Free States, with his status in the Slave States.

The institution of slavery, its policy and spirit, is, as one might pre-suppose, hostile to the enfranchisement of the black, not only as taking a labourer away from his remunerative toil (remunerative to the master), but as establishing amongst the slaves a leaven of freedom and of discontent with their lot, *as the slave-owner has come to think*. Aristotle, pagan as he was, inculcated the expediency of holding out to the slave the hope of becoming free as an incentive to fidelity and industry ; but in our Slave States, this hope, which was *once* held before the slaves, has been long taken from them, and the fear of punishment is now the only incentive to labour for the master. For many years past, legislative enactments have discouraged or forbidden emancipation. Thus, in *Louisiana*, no master is allowed to emancipate a slave under thirty years of age ; if older than this, the consent of the neighbouring planters must first be obtained, and the master must bind himself to see that the free man be suitably provided for. In 1820, the *South Carolina* Legislature enacted that no slave should be freed without a special law passed ; in 1841, this same body declared null and void all deeds or wills by which a master should direct that slaves whom he wished to free should be taken into a neighbouring State and there emancipated. Other States have passed similar laws, and now, as a general rule, no one can enfranchise a slave, unless he provide for his removal beyond the limits of the Republic. In some of the States, perhaps in all, a slave who reveals a conspiracy amongst his fellows is declared free by the Legislature, and his master compensated at the public expense. We have already seen that, in *Virginia*, in order to diminish the desire of slaves to become free, *free negro women* were taxed, in contradistinction to white women who were exempt from personal taxation.

"In *Cuba*, every slave has the privilege of emancipating himself, by paying a price, which does not depend upon the selfish exactions of the masters, but it is either a fixed price, or else is fixed in each case by disinterested appraisers."—(Olmsted, note to p. 445.)

The free negroes in the Slave States, having no protector, are at the mercy of all, and are despised by all, even by the slaves. They cannot act as witnesses, excepting against a slave or another free negro ; and they are not allowed, at least in *South Carolina*, to qualify *on oath* in Court, this privilege, or distinction, being reserved for the whites. They are forbidden to carry arms on penalty of whipping. According to the law, they are directed to dress in very coarse clothing, as a mark of distinction. A free negro who insults or strikes a white, is punished by fine or imprisonment ; in *South*

*Carolina*, and perhaps elsewhere, if he be first attacked, and in self-defence should kill his opponent, he is indicted for *murder*. He is not allowed to marry other than a free negress. Free negroes are not permitted to assemble for religious worship, either before sunrise, or after sunset; and, after nine o'clock at night, they are liable to removal by the patrol from any religious assembly, even of whites, and to receive twenty lashes. If found beyond the limits of their municipality, they are liable to be arrested by the patrol, or by any passing white man. In *Tennessee*, they are not allowed to travel by railway, unless some one deposits bail for them in one thousand dollars each; if they choose to quit the State, and take up their abode in another Slave State, they are liable, if found within the border of the first subsequently to this change of domicile, to be whipped, and for a repetition of the offence, to be sold into slavery. Any free negro arriving in a Southern port, is immediately imprisoned and detained, at the expense of the vessel, until the latter quit the port.—(*Revue des deux Mondes*, 15 Dec., 1860.)

In *South Carolina*, an Act was passed in 1834, which provides, amongst other things, “*if any free person of colour*, or a slave, shall keep any school, or other place of instruction for teaching any slave, or *free person of colour*, to read or write, such person shall be liable to the same fine, imprisonment, and corporal punishment, as are by this Act imposed and inflicted on free persons of colour and slaves for teaching slaves to read or write;” viz., “*if a free person of colour*, he shall be whipped not exceeding fifty lashes, and fined not exceeding fifty dollars; and if a slave, shall be whipped, not exceeding fifty lashes.”

In *Virginia*, according to the Code of 1849, “every assemblage of negroes for the purpose of instruction in reading or writing shall be an unlawful assembly. Any justice may issue his warrant to any officer or other person, requiring him to enter any place where such assemblage may be, and seize any negro therein; and he, or any other justice, may order such negro to be punished with stripes.” It will be perceived that there is no distinction made here between slaves and free negroes. Again, “if a *white person* assemble with negroes for the purpose of instructing them to read or write, he shall be confined in jail not exceeding six months, and fined not exceeding one hundred dollars.” In *Georgia*, it was enacted in 1829, “If any slave, grown, or *free person of colour*, or any *white person*, shall teach any other slave, negro, or *free person of colour*, to read or write, either written or printed characters, *the said free person of colour* or slave shall be punished by fine and whipping, or fine or whipping, at the discretion of the Court; and if a white person so offend he, she, or they, shall be punished with fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the common jail, at the discretion of the Court.” In *Alabama*, “any person



who shall attempt to teach *any free person of colour*, or slave, to spell, read, or write, shall, upon conviction, &c., be fined in a sum not less than two hundred and fifty dollars, nor more than five hundred dollars."—(Cairnes, pp. 105, 106.)

It is true that the Slave States have, in some measure, freed themselves from the odium to which such laws as the above would subject any civilized communities in the estimation of all humane men; but it has been only by *banishing* the free negroes from their limits, and under circumstances which really increase that odium. This is one of the best proofs of the fallacy of the recent English idea, that slavery is more likely to be abolished under Southern independence than under Federal supremacy.

In 1859, the Legislature of *Arkansas* passed a law of banishment against all *free negroes*, and all who had not left the State before the expiration of the year were to be sold by auction to the highest bidder. The Legislature of *Missouri* passed a similar law, and enacted also that *any free negro*, from any other State, who should enter the State of *Missouri*, and spend more than twelve hours therein, should be immediately arrested and sold as a slave. The *Louisiana* Legislature passed a similar law. The *Mississippi* Legislature allowed the *free negroes* only six months to quit the State, on pain of being sold as slaves, and directed that the proceeds of such sales should be paid into the Common School Fund. The *Georgia* Legislature enacted that all *free negroes* convicted of idleness or immorality, should be enslaved for one year, and on a repetition of the offence, should be sold into perpetual slavery; and also that *any free negro* convicted, and condemned for any offence to the payment of a fine, should, if unable to pay the fine, be sold for the benefit of the treasury. Petitions, signed by many inhabitants of *Maryland*, were presented to the Legislature of that State, praying that its *seventy-five thousand free negroes* should be sold as slaves and distributed amongst the white citizens, on the grounds that "the social and industrial interests of the State, the manifest destiny of the negro race, and the inalienable rights of the whites," required this measure; further motives assigned were, "1st, That the free negro does not work, becomes corrupted by idleness, and it is our duty to improve his moral condition by enslaving him. 2nd, By working, the free negro becomes a competitor against the white man, and the preservation of our just prerogative of superiority demands that this immoral competition shall be at once put an end to." The Legislature did not adopt these contradictory propositions, but it authorized the whites to make the *children of free negroes* work without asking the consent of the parents; and it passed another law, permitting *free negroes* to *sell themselves as slaves*."—(See the "*Revue des deux Mondes*," 15 Dec., 1860.)

Thus, it is evident that, if the free blacks are not treated with

the consideration they ought to meet with in the Free States, they have no consideration whatever in the Slave States; and thus the validity of the English argument against us is completely destroyed, in so far as it was intended to favour the South. If there has been any attempt in any Free State to exclude free negroes, it has been a purely party manoeuvre.

I ask again, can any one *really believe* that the Southern Confederacy will ever voluntarily abolish slavery?

It cannot be pretended that all the Americans who now desire and fight for the abolition of slavery, do so solely, or chiefly, to benefit the slaves. The motive varies with different persons and classes; but this is no valid objection against the *result*. Amongst those, in England, who voted in favour of the different Reform Bills, for the repeal of the Corn Laws, for the Abolition of Slavery in the British dependencies, &c., &c., there were many who thus voted not because they themselves really desired the success of these measures, or had at heart the welfare of the masses for whose benefit they were passed; and yet their affirmative votes were not too harshly criticised by the real friends of progress. And of the subscribers to the many munificent *relief funds* which have, within the past ten years, rendered the liberality of England famous wherever beneficence is honoured, how many there were who gave their money from some other motive than that of pure, unalloyed and unadulterated charity! yet their contributions were not the less thankfully received and duly published. And so with respect to the present abolition sentiment in the Free States of America. Whatever may be the motive which has begotten this sentiment, the fact of its actual existence and growing diffusion is undeniable. And those who, elsewhere, long to see slavery abolished, would do well to embrace this fact, and make the most and best of it, assured that nothing but this very war, *undertaken by the South to establish and perpetuate slavery*, and the measures into which the United States' Government has been forced in self-defence, could have produced the overthrow of the system, so long as Europe was dependent upon Southern slavery for cotton, and was willing to continue in this dependence.

## V.—THE RELATION OF ENGLAND TO THIS CONTEST.

I have thus shown, by official statistics, and by the testimony of Southerners themselves, and from other equally trustworthy evidences, what has been the past career of the South with reference to slavery, and what is probably to be its future course, if the Southern Confederacy become an independent power. I have exhibited the condition to which slavery has brought the South, in all those inte-

rests which characterize a society as being civilized or otherwise. And now, I ask, What attitude could any disinterested person (if any human being *can be disinterested* when such momentous interests are at stake) have supposed, *a priori*, that *England* would have assumed with reference to the two parties immediately engaged in the American civil war? The principles involved in the contest are so clearly marked, "that he that runneth may read, and the way-faring man, though a fool, need not err therein." On one side, we have a Government established avowedly "*to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity*," and which has, by the common consent of all mankind, accomplished these objects for its white subjects, and has failed in its original intention to secure the same to all without distinction of colour, only because it has been perverted and falsified by the influence of the party now in open rebellion against it; on the other side, we have a Government *confessedly* based upon *slavery* as *its corner-stone*, and whose "*mission*," as interpreted and proclaimed by its clerical advocates and expounders, is to "*perpetuate and extend slavery*." On one side, we see that the diffusion of education in all its departments, religious and secular, is made a prominent obligation both to Government and people; on the other, we find it taught, that "*the policy which discourages further extension of knowledge is necessary*;" and as to religious instruction, a modern Sandwich Islander might teach the way of salvation to the eight millions of poor whites and slaves. On one side, we find that labour is honoured, and that industry reaps a rich reward of everything which tends to make man happy, wise, and good; on the other, labour is a disgrace, "*and the poor of the land are hopelessly doomed to ignorance, poverty, and crime*," to use the significant language of a Governor of South Carolina. — (Olmsted, p. 505.) On one side, we have freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, as a natural and necessary result of our institutions in times of peace; on the other, "The traveller from New England and other Free States no sooner penetrates into the Slave land, than he sees all around him the proofs that *slavery* is omnipresent. Thought is not free." — (Charles Mackay, in 1859.) In short, on one side we see accomplished all that England has been fighting for ever since the Saxon Heptarchy; and on the other, we find everything which England has been contending *against*, and *African slavery* in addition.

Who could have imagined that England would have hesitated a moment as to which side she should give the aid of her moral support? Indeed, at first, there was no such hesitation. The *Times* said on the 29th November, 1860, a few months before the war was begun by the South, "Let there be no mistake as to *English* opinion on this subject. If we have paid a sincere homage to the

rising greatness of America, it has not been to that which the Southerners are anxious to conserve, but to that which they are striving to destroy. All that is noble and venerable in the United States is associated with its Federal Constitution. It is not the demonstrations of Southern ruffianism in Congress, or the filibustering aggrandisement of the South, or the Fugitive Slave Law, or the Dred Scott decisions, or the Kansas-Nebraska Act,—it is not these, or any other, triumphs of Democratic insolence that has challenged the admiration of Europe. Mr. Lincoln will carry with him the support of those who, however tolerant of slavery, will not tamely acquiesce in its becoming the basis of *an illegal and hostile Confederacy.*”

There spake out *the Christianity, the civilization, the old anti-slavery spirit* of England; and it was what America *expected*. She did not look for English *assistance*; but she did *hope* that a hearty English cheer would roll over the Atlantic to give her God-speed; she did *believe* that *Christian* England would hold aloft the emblem of our common faith, as it appeared of old to Constantine, and bid her “*fight the good fight.*”

But she has been egregiously disappointed. This same *Times* said, a little later, of the contest which was begun, “This war is the most groundless and wanton civil conflict of which history gives us any account.” Recently, too, this journal upheld slavery from Scripture, and reproved the thousands of honest Englishmen who were meeting to awaken the dormant anti-slavery sentiment of England. The *Edinburgh Review* proclaimed, but little more than a year ago, that “The North has no better claim to force its policy and dominion upon the South *than the South has to infect the North with the taint of slavery.*” An aspirant to the House of Commons, a man whose *name* is much more encouraging than his political principles, pretended in a speech at Maidstone, in January last, that “the cause of the Southern Federation is the cause of Freedom, is the cause of English feeling, is the cause of Constitutional Government all over the world.” And, with a few notable exceptions, England has completely identified herself and her interests in this matter with the Southern Confederacy, so far as one can judge from the temper and tone of most of her public men in and out of Parliament. As to the English press generally, its abuse of the people of the Free States and of the cause which they now uphold (which cause has become daily more strongly defined for freedom since the *Times* penned the first quotation we have just made from its columns) is so gross and so vulgar, that the *New York Herald* in its worst days might be proud of its comparative purity. And in these respects England stands almost alone in Europe. With scarce an exception, the liberal press and the liberal politicians and thoughtful men of the Continent are ranged

upon the same side as the *Daily News*, J. Stuart Mill, Professor Cairnes, the Duke of Argyll, the late Sir George Lewis, the Right Hon. T. Milner Gibson, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, Mr. Forster, and some others in England. The only country on the face of the globe out of America, from which the Southern cause meets with encouragement and derives aid, is that very land whence it had the least right to hope for either—*England*; from English merchants, English ship-builders and shippers, English manufacturers, the English press, the English aristocracy. The mass of the English people, most of whom are considered unworthy or incompetent to share in the legislation of their country, (for which, in time of war, *they* are chiefly called upon to shed their blood,) have, during all this contest, manifested a degree of knowledge of its real causes and issues, a spirit of patient and honorable submission under trials and sufferings, and a consistent regard to English principles, which ought to shame most of their hereditary and elected rulers.

There is no attempt made, indeed it would be impossible, to *disprove* the fact, that the North and the South are characterized, respectively, by the principles which are herein set forth as belonging to each. Before the war broke out, no one in England denied it; but since, there has been a persistent and successful effort to throw this fact into oblivion, and to blind people's eyes, and confuse their understandings, by arguments and assertions which are either unfounded or have little or no bearing upon the real question involved. The Southern Confederacy has been taken "*in tow*" by certain parties and their organs; and the success of this commercial transaction is furthered by arousing national and class jealousies and setting up presumed interests. Thus the two nations who have more in common to unite them than any other two nations in the world, and who have fewer *real* causes of mutual estrangement, are made hostile to each other. All sorts of irrelevant and, generally, ill-founded or exaggerated charges are made (and always against the North;) and public men seem inclined, with one of the movers of the last "*Address*," "to leave *humanity* out of the question, and to look merely at the *commercial interests* of the country."

I will not follow the English press through all the shifting phases which it has exhibited during this unhappy contest; nor will I attempt to answer all its most unfair and most unwarrantable charges against America and American institutions. My desire is to evoke reason, not to stir up passion and prejudice; but I will say that the *evils of a free press* have been very clearly and fully exemplified, by the way in which men who can write well, either for or against truth, have, under the cowardly shield of their *incognito*, committed outrages against truth, honour, duty, and decency, which, I am sure, no honest Englishman would have disgraced himself by perpetrating over his signature.



There are a few charges made against us, which require, however, a passing notice.

1. Only a few days ago, in the House of Commons, a prominent speaker brought again the accusation of *barbarism*, because the United States' Government caused some stone-laden vessels to be sunk so as to obstruct some of the channels of one, or more, of the Southern harbours. And this, notwithstanding that it had been clearly shown, that *Great Britain* fully intended to do the same thing to the harbour of *Boulogne*, and that she actually did so to the harbour of *Alexandria* during her last war with France; and to the harbours of some of our northern-lake ports, and to the very harbour of *Savannah*, during the Anglo-American war, and that she bound herself by treaty with the American Government to remove the obstructions she had placed at the last-mentioned point.

And what has been "the head and front" of *General Butler's* offence? Simply, that as commander of a small force holding a city in which martial law had been proclaimed, he issued an order, that all women who so far forgot the position of their sex as to annoy and irritate and insult soldiers in discharge of duty, should come under the operation of an old municipal law, which requires that lewd women who are found in the streets after a certain hour, shall be locked up in the guard-house. General Butler never had more than 9,000 men under his command, against a population of 180,000 in a city, of which the Sheriff said to Mr. Russell, "It is a perfect *hell* upon earth, and nothing will ever put a stop to murders, manslaughters, and deadly assaults, till it is made penal to carry arms."—(Russell's "*Diary*," vol. i., p. 353.)

This proclamation, injudiciously worded it may have been, has been exaggerated and distorted out of all its original intention and proportions, and by a people and by official personages of a Government whose officers, a few years ago, in the mere wantonness of cold-blooded revenge, caused scores of Indian captives to be blown from British guns. Who has ever heard that these barbarous acts were rebuked or punished? The Indians rebelled against oppression; the South has rebelled to oppress. Mr. Cobden well said, that the English are friendly to all rebels, save rebels against English supremacy.—(*Times*, April 25th.)

2. What can be more unjust and uncalled-for than the reiterated assertions in Parliament and out of it, that it was English threats which induced the United States' Government to relinquish the "*Trent* prisoners?" Every one knows that Mr. Seward's despatch to Mr. Adams, declaring that the Government did not direct their seizure, regretted it, and was disposed to make any suitable reparation for it, was dated on the self-same day as the British demand for their restoration. One of the principal London journals, which has the reputation of being a semi-official organ of the Government,

*invented two deliberate falsehoods, first, to conceal from the public the fact that Mr. Adams had received such a despatch; and, secondly, to exculpate the British Government from the wrong done in ignoring and withholding its contents, while the howl for war was prolonged and echoed, according to the journals of the day, from the pulpit of at least one fashionable London church.*

And no Englishman has had the candour to say in public that the reason why the American Government did not at once yield up its prisoners, without waiting for the demand for them, was, evidently and wisely, that *Great Britain*—which, as a *belligerent*, (and when, before now, has she been a *neutral* when there was any fighting at sea?) has always been accustomed to treat neutrals ruthlessly, from seizing a whole fleet at Copenhagen, to impressing seamen by hundreds from American ships—should, when a neutral, *place on record, in the archives of the United States, a full, formal, and official recognition of and claim for the rights of neutrals.*

3. What can be thought of the persistent attempt, in defiance of all history, to fasten upon *Republican institutions* the especial odium of making war? Is the confidence of the English in the superiority of their own political and social systems so small, that they fear to lose any opportunity of detracting from those of other nations? And how can any member of the British Parliament, or any thoughtful Englishman, have imagined he had found in English history any warrant for inculcating that Monarchism, constitutional or other, is more incompatible with, or less promotive of, war and lavish expenditure, political immorality and corruption, judicial venality, and utter worthlessness and incapacity in the highest personages, than Democratic-Republicanism? England had one *King*, and he has not been the only such, of whom it was said with too much truth,

“His word no man relied on;  
He never said a foolish thing,  
Nor ever did a wise one.”

There was a long period of English history, when the Prime Minister *boasted* that every English *legislator* could be bought, and he governed the country accordingly. No nation in the world has ever produced *judicial* personages at once so learned and so venal as England. What historical genius was at the same time so great a *military Commander* and so profound a traitor as the Duke of Marlborough? Count the number of *wars* in which England has been engaged, and the number of years she has spent in warring; weigh the treasure she has expended, say squandered; measure the blood she has shed, (her own and strangers'—Affghan, American, Burmese, Caffre, French, German, Hottentot, Indian,—and so on through the whole alphabet, for her hand has been against every man, and every man's hand against her,) since America became a

nation ; and, on the other side, apply the same arithmetic to ourselves, and see to which political system the hideous surplus belongs.

And here we insist that it is eminently unjust to hold "the *American* system of politics" responsible either for this war, or for most other abuses which have been perpetrated in the name, but contrary to the spirit, of our Democratic-Republican institutions. For we have had implanted and growing up in our midst an opposite system,—the aristocratic, oligarchic system of the Slave States,—completely ruling its own section, and swaying the policy of the whole country, and drawing the very Constitution astray from its normal and beneficent orbit, like an immense and baneful planet, Leverrier's, for example—deviating the majestic march of the earth itself.

What can be more offensive to common sense, and to international obligations, than for a man, occupying the exalted position of *Premier of England*, to speak of "wide-spread misery and desolation," as being "*created, in the West, by Democratic and Republican institutions?*" And, he continued, "*Our institutions not only confer happiness and tranquillity upon the people of these realms, but enable them to enjoy the most perfect freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, and of action, and all undeterred either by the edicts of despotic authority, or the Lynch-law of an ungovernable mob.*" Is not every one involuntarily reminded by this effusion, of the Pharisee in the temple thanking God that he was not as other men, or even as these Re-Republicans ? Who knows better than he, that no country, no form of government, no political institutions, have passed through so many civil wars, as his own ; that no land, excepting France in her great Revolution, has been the theatre of such terrible *mobs*, and so extended and devastating in their operations, as England ; that no English Government has ever hesitated, or ever will hesitate, to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, the right to freedom of thought, of writing, of speech, and of action, and any other "*inalienable* right of Englishmen," whenever, in its judgment, the necessities of the country have demanded, or shall hereafter require, such suspension ? This was done in the last small rebellion in Ireland, as the Foreign Secretary admitted. And if any one wishes to learn how thoroughly the same system was carried out during the war with France,—not a civil war,—let him read what Macaulay says of Mr. Pitt's administration.

As to *Lynch-law*, it is almost one of "*the peculiar institutions*" of the South, where an abolitionist, or a suspected abolitionist, more commonly, or a negro, who has in self-defence, or otherwise, committed some desperate act, is hung, or drowned, or whipped to death, or burned.

As to *Mobs*, about which we have had so many extraordinary predictions lately, we scarcely hear of such assemblages, excepting



occasionally in our largest cities. The population of the United States is the most law-loving and the most law-abiding in the world ; we have had no standing armies, and hardly a pretence to a police force, even in our cities. Even our foreign population, which, in Europe, constitutes *the mob*, when it comes to America loses its lawlessness. Why? Because we treat such people as our own citizens ; we acknowledge their rights ; we grant them privileges ; we hold out to them the sure prospect of improvement and advancement ; we give freely to their children and themselves the means of education ; and they become useful and intelligent members of the community. Under the old system of restraint and severity, an insane asylum was as though "possessed of devils ;" under the modern method of mildness and freedom, its inmates "are found sitting, clothed, and in their right minds."

The suspension of the *Habeas Corpus Act*, of which we have heard so much outcry in England, but so little complaint in the United States, (and for the simple reason that all good citizens who fulfil their obligations to the Government have nothing to fear from it, *law being made as a protection against law-breakers*.) was expressly provided for by the Federal Constitution, although this instrument did not specify with whom its enforcement should rest, whether with the President, or Congress, or both. But now this uncertainty has been removed. Therefore, let not England be any longer concerned about our rights. We have not lost them ; we have only lent them to the Government ; they are some of the jewels which we have deposited in the public treasury for the better conservation of all the others. We know that our Government is an honest one, and that it will freely return to us, with interest, what we have unhesitatingly lent to it.

4. One word about the War, and the composition of our armies, and I have done with English accusations and sneers.

England should be the last country in the world to make merry over the alleged incompetency of United States' officials, civil and military, in the management of a great war. Her own annals are filled with similar exhibitions, and, under the comparative circumstances of the two nations and governments, to a much more glaring degree. The history of all English wars shows that it has required years of lavish and patriotic expenditures of blood and treasure, to place England in a condition to fight with advantage. Even in the late Crimean war, she spent *two woeful years*, in alliance with the most military nation in the world, in gaining a single city. Read, again, Macaulay's account of Mr. Pitt's military administration ; read the Duke of Wellington's reiterated complaints of the animosities, the luke-warm patriotism, the almost treasons, of political opponents to the administration which sent him out in command ; read his criticisms on the imbecility of his subordinates, the want of discipline of his soldiers.

And then reflect, for a moment, upon the vast territory over which our civil war is spread ; the wildness of the country, and the nature of the roads which traverse it ; its capabilities of defence ; the thoroughly peaceful habits of our people ; the utter want of military experience on the part both of Government and citizens ; the complete absence, when the war began, of a *nucleus* of an army ; of the immense numbers of troops raised, and to be prepared for war, and to be supported in war ; think of all these adverse circumstances on our side. And think of the character of our enemies, brave, determined, fighting at home, familiar with their country, accustomed to look up to their rulers as to exalted beings, having an immense body of slaves to support them, so that the white population should be free to fight. Let Englishmen think of the true nature of the war, and be sparing of carping, hostile, and vain-glorious criticisms.

As to the composition of our armies, we are told they all fight for hire, and not for love of country, that they are chiefly made up of foreigners, &c. There are, unquestionably, thousands of foreigners in our service, as there ought to be, for they, too, are citizens. But the great mass of our soldiers are native Americans, and infinitely superior to the men who make up an English army. And for the rest, there is scarcely a family of position, education, and wealth in the land, which is not represented in the war. John Van Buren recently enumerated a score of the best families of New York, whose sons are in the field, and the same is true of every State from Maine to Maryland, from Delaware to California ; they represent the education, the refinement, the "good blood" and the wealth of the Free States. They are animated by a sincere love for their country, its Constitution, and its Union ; that same love of country under the full influence of which the dying Spartan boy was borne proudly homeward on his bloody shield, and laid with a song of triumph on the threshold of his mother's cottage ; that noble love of country which prompted the stern epitaph of the gallant Brasidas, "*Plures habet Sparta Brasida meliores.*" They are our "*Curtii*," who plunge into the yawning gulf of Rebellion to save their *Fatherland*. *God bless them !*

By these and similar wide-of-the-mark criticisms, the public sentiment of England (which abhors slavery as much as it ever did, and loves liberty as much) is sought to be led astray from the true issues of the American civil war. Recently, however, and for the first time, perhaps, in Parliament, the question has been brought back to its true bearing. Earl Russell, who, by family descent and by a life-long devotion to human rights and the principles of political liberty, ought to be the standard-bearer of England against this latest and most repulsive attempt at despotism, made a distinct avowal of *obligation* and *duty* in contradistinction to *interest*.—(March 23rd, 1863.) After recalling the instances in

which Great Britain had interfered in the civil commotions of other countries, his Lordship said, "In all these instances, whether the wars were carried on by our ancestors, or in our own times, there is nothing of which an Englishman need be ashamed; for, if we have taken part in interventions, it has been in behalf of the independence, the freedom, and the welfare of great portions of mankind. I should be sorry if there were any intervention in our time which would bear another character. I hope this will not be the case; that no interests of our own, deeply as they may affect the industry and well-being of large portions of our fellow-countrymen, will induce us to set an example far different from that which was set us by our ancestors. But, whenever we shall be called upon to interfere—may it be seldom—I trust it will be in the cause of liberty, and to promote the freedom of mankind, as we have hitherto done."

America asks for nothing else from England than that her Government and people should keep these just and noble sentiments constantly before them, as guides in this controversy.

The two English *Interests* which Southern independence is expected to promote, are the *political* and the *commercial*.

1. As to the *Political interest*. In *Blackwood's Magazine* for Jan., 1863, at page 25, we read, "Every person who reflects upon the matter, must be aware that it is the *interest* of all nations, but especially of *England*, to have more than one great Republic on the American continent, as the United States were fast becoming such a *nuisance* in the republic of nations, that if, by any accident, they should succeed in their war of subjugation, their insolence and arrogance would be more intolerable than ever;" and the same strain of vulgar abuse is echoed in every hole and corner of England. In the debate just alluded to, the same interest is invoked, though in more parliamentary language. The speaker in favour of Recognition of the South gave as one of his reasons that Great Britain *requires* "an ally on the other side of the Atlantic, and that ally the North could not furnish, *not from any difference of interests or feelings of antipathy*," but because the United States was the offspring of a successful revolt against England. Does any sane Englishman suppose, for a moment, that England can, without renouncing some of her most cherished principles, form and preserve an alliance with the South? It is confessed that *the North has* "no difference of interests or feelings of antipathy" as to England; but is it not absolutely certain that the South has both, and that it was these "*feelings of antipathy*" against *England* which made the South, during her existence in the old Union, the only bitter enemy of England of any part of our country? And is it supposable that if she becomes independent and has a special career before her, she will, with vastly greater reason for hostility to England, become an ally, unless the alliance be mutually beneficial, as well to the

"*peculiar institution*" of the South, as to the special interests of England? It is not in reason but that England must hate the principles and policy advocated by the South. Why, then, should the narrow-minded dislike and jealousy which certain political parties in England entertain against Republican institutions and the rapid growth of the United States, be allowed to place England in the false position of advocate and aid of Southern designs?

It is true that our political institutions and social distinctions differ from those of England. Ours are best for a new, England's for an old, country. Let each nation, instead of carping at those of the other, be content with its own institutions, and endeavour to apply them most wisely for the greatest benefit of all its children. England will seek in vain, in all the world, an alliance so strongly recommended by mutual interests, and so naturally marked out for her, as that with the United States. Has not England, hitherto, been directly benefited in proportion to the growth and prosperity of the United States? Whatever has enriched and advantaged the latter, has it not re-acted in favour of England? This would be an alliance not only of the two Governments, but still more of the two peoples. On *our* side, we have, during the last twenty years at least, given so many proofs of our good feeling, that there can be no doubt of its existence and strength, in spite of temporary expressions to the contrary. Even the principal mover in favour of Southern recognition was compelled to acknowledge that the United States had no interests opposed to those of England, nor antipathies against her. And it will only be in consequence of fancied political interests or commercial advantages pressed in England to injure the United States, that this natural and beneficent alliance can be converted into a bitter and protracted animosity.

2. The most plausible argument urged in England in behalf of the South and Southern independence is, that *the Commercial interests* of England will be furthered thereby. This question will bear investigation, and by examining it an additional insight into the condition of the South will be gained.

It will be readily admitted that, if the South become independent, and England gain her as a customer, and establish with her a system of free trade, the *United States* will cease to be as beneficial a client as heretofore. This will be a thing of course; for, first, the United States will have the interest on an immense debt to pay, taxation will be very largely increased, the annual expenses of the country arising out of this very establishment on our Southern border of "an illegal and hostile Confederacy," as the *Times* called it, will be vastly augmented beyond the previous revenues, and thus, from having been the most extravagant people in the world, ours will, of necessity, become a prudent and economical one, and England will be the chief sufferer thereby.

And, moreover, there is no denying what is, indeed, an admitted fact, that the South is now receiving directly and notoriously in England most illegal and timely aid. Whether the British Government can prevent it or not, ships are being fitted out in English ship-yards, manned by English seamen, and they quit English ports under the English flag, avowedly to prey upon American commerce, and to embroil the two Governments in war. And an extraordinary feature in the transactions is, that a *member of Parliament*, himself concerned in the building and fitting-up of one or two of these ships, declares from his place in the House, "that the officers of the Government had every facility afforded them for inspecting the ship (one of them) during the progress of building; they only left her when the tug left, and they were obliged to declare that she left Liverpool a perfectly legitimate transaction."—(*Times*, March 28th.) The law officers of the Crown, on the contrary, declared that she was a most *illegitimate* transaction. And yet this *member of Parliament* defended this "transaction," having had a perfect knowledge from the first of the use to which the ship was to be applied, and of the Royal Proclamation, commanding all British subjects not to engage in such "transactions."

Again, in British West India harbours, *depôts* of contraband goods are accumulated under the eyes of British officials, waiting an opportunity to "run the blockade" of Southern harbours. Yet such attempts have also been strictly forbidden by the Proclamation. And these are said by Mr. Cobden to be under "*joint-stock companies*."

Now, is it not folly to make laws, unless the enacting power endeavours to enforce them? What is the object of law? It is useless to pretend that the British Government cannot prevent these infringements of the law. If the Customs' officers were held responsible for every such infraction, would not the offence become more rare? If this member of Parliament, who so unblushingly avows that he deliberately violated the law, was made to answer for his conduct, would other vessels be built in his ship-yard for the same purpose as the "*Alabama*?" If the law is not susceptible of *enforcement*, why, if Government really desired that it should be enforced, does not Government ask for the necessary powers? It would not hesitate to apply for such powers, were *English interests alone* at stake; in fact, it would be an *admitted duty then*, and can it be any less a duty now, when not only the interests of England, but of a kindred and really friendly nation, are involved; and when, in consequence of the want of such powers, war is lowering over the two countries, to the disgrace of Christianity? And what makes the case still stronger is, that the United States' Government on *two occasions*, first, during the Anglo-French war, and again during the Canadian rebellion, did, *at the request of Great Britain*,

so modify and execute its laws against the building, equipment, and sending out of privateers, under circumstances similar to the present. Why should England hesitate now to imitate the American example? There is no possibility of such a step being misunderstood, under present difficulties, and after the two precedents set by America herself. Who doubts the *might of England*, especially as America is now situated? We appeal to her *justice*; is *that* to be questioned?—(See Mr. Cobden's *Speech*, April 24th, and Appendix.)

And the acknowledgment of the Southern Confederacy as a belligerent power, only three months after the inauguration of its *provisional* Government, by a proclamation issued immediately on the arrival of the new United States' Minister in London, and without paying him the decent compliment to confer with him on the subject,—was that the act of a *friendly* Government? Evidently not. Admitting that the British Government has maintained an honourable neutrality since, it must be clear to anyone who is innocent of the wiles and subterfuges of diplomacy, that, by conferring belligerent rights upon rebels, at that early moment, an act of hostility was committed against the State to which those rebels owed allegiance. The definite separation of the two parties was then acknowledged; any subsequent recognition will be merely complementary to this first acknowledgment.

And, moreover, in conferring belligerent rights, and at the same time refusing to the Confederacy the customary permission to bring the prizes taken by her cruisers into British ports, (as the Government felt bound to do under the Treaty of Paris,) England virtually encouraged privateering which it was the object of this Treaty to prevent. And, having assumed a position of neutrality between the United States and the South, the Government felt bound to *deny* to the former the privileges which *were not conferred* upon the latter. Thus a most direct and decided insult was inflicted upon the United States. For this latter power had long ago been recognised; England had treaties of amity and commerce with her, by which it was agreed to allow to her commercial and national marine all the privileges granted "to the most favoured nations;" but now she is robbed of these advantages in favour of a political attempt which England has not yet acknowledged; her recognised national armed vessels are degraded to the level of a species of *legitimate* corsair. At the time of the formation of these conventions, the Southern Confederacy did not exist; but no sooner did she declare herself, than out came this proclamation of belligerency in her favour, by which was endorsed her act of separation, and she placed upon the same footing as England's old and long-recognised friend. The United States, an established and powerful (too powerful, perhaps) nation, was degraded from her honourable position to the level of

this new political conception, whose avowed principles have at last extorted from the Foreign Secretary the tardy admission that he "should be *very sorry*" to have Great Britain recognise it as a nation.

What other belief can one indulge, with regard to this act, than that it was one of *real hostility*, under the guise of neutrality? The Government did not wish to be violent, oh, no! it merely gave a gentle aristocratic ease—off the stocks to this Southern Ship of State; and if this new-fashioned "*Ram*" should bump against the old craft and sink her, why, so much the better; her timbers were rotten; *all Republics are rotten*.

Well, under these circumstances of English aid rendered to the South, American trading with England, in the event of Southern independence, will meet with an additional obstacle. We shall not only be *unable* to import largely of British goods, but we shall be *most unwilling* so to do. We shall be strongly impelled to get from the Continent all the foreign *necessaries* which we shall consume,—and there are not many such,—rather than get them from England, which we shall have too much reason to regard as our enemy. Therefore, I repeat, the United States, which has been the largest foreign customer of England, will become far less profitable to her; and a war with the United States, which is occasionally talked of, would only make bad worse. England could and would do us a vast deal of mischief, and we, in turn, should inflict some upon her. But the losses occasioned by stoppage of trade and supplies; the permanent and intensified ill-will produced on both sides, and especially on the side of the weaker power, and the one which would probably be the greatest sufferer in the contest,—to say nothing of the "*Dés-humanité*" of such a war,—who shall estimate all these?

Now, let us endeavour to discover what would be to England the real value of this new customer, supposing the South to become independent, and supposing, too, that a direct trade on the most liberal terms for England shall be established.

In 1859–60, the *direct importations* into the States now constituting the Southern Confederacy amounted to £4,646,166; into the other States of the Union, to £65,817,709. But this is open to three sources of error. 1st, some portion of the foreign goods came from other countries than Great Britain; 2nd, a certain portion also was consumed in the States not belonging to the Confederacy, lying on the Mississippi and her tributaries, and in foreign countries in direct trade with the Southern ports; 3rd, the South also received foreign goods first imported into Northern harbours and transported thence coast-wise and by inland communications. In fact, there is no way of ascertaining what the amount of British goods consumed at the South may be. But an intelligent British shipper or manufacturer,

if he know the condition of the South, as to the character of her population, their general means and requirements, &c., would be able to tell sufficiently well what such a customer would be worth to him. Fortunately, the materials for supplying such information are ample.

The population of the Confederacy as at present constituted was, in 1860, composed of whites, 5,019,448; free blacks, 132,760; slaves, 3,520,116. The two years or more of war have probably not materially increased the numbers of the whites. The area of the country is 763,606 square miles, or about 470,000,000 acres, of which 42,684,965 are "*improved*." Admitting the same proportion of *slave-owners* in the Confederacy as existed in all the Slave States prior to the war, (350,000 to 3,950,805 slaves,) we shall have in the former, say 216,566 whites owning all the slaves, and 4,802,892 whites, who own no slaves, but who are generally poor, and go by the appellation of "*mean whites*," "*white trash*," &c.

The population remaining loyal to the Constitution is composed of 21,726,736 whites, 361,462 free blacks, and 430,689 slaves, within an area of 1,023,149 square miles, or 713,972,520 acres, of which 70,010,956 are "*improved*."

If we add the territories, we shall have a further area of 1,344,000 square miles, and a population of 220,149. But we shall say nothing of the territories, inasmuch as they constitute a debatable ground, theoretically.

How much, then, will the 216,566 slave-owners, the 4,802,892 non-slave-holding whites, and the 3,520,116 slaves, be worth to England as consumers of the fruits of her industry?

First, as to the *Slave Proprietors*. The number of slaves owned by individuals varies from one to a thousand, or more. It is stated of the whole Slave States together, that there are of holders of 1 slave, 63,820; of between 1 and 5, 105,683; between 5 and 10, 80,765; between 10 and 20, 54,595; between 20 and 50, 29,733; between 50 and 100, 6,196; between 100 and 200, 1,479; between 200 and 300, 187; between 300 and 500, 56; between 500 and 1,000, 9; of 1,000 and more, 2. According to De Bow, the whole number of actual slave-owners in the whole of the Slave States was only 186,551; the number of such "entered more than once," 2,000; number of non-slave-owning slave-hirers, 153,974. Aggregate, 347,525.—(Helper, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-119.) It will be fair to assume that the consumption of foreign goods will be exclusively, almost, on the part of the more wealthy proprietors, those who keep slaves not for hire, but to till their lands. And admitting even that the whole body of slave-owners had the same tastes, the same habits, the same demands for the goods which are imported from Europe, as men of the same station living at the North, still, their numbers



being so much smaller, it follows that their consumption of such goods would be proportionally less. But we must admit that at least one-half the whole number of slave-owners cannot be in this condition,—the small farmers, for example, who own not more than five slaves each. In fact, it is only the better class of planters, men of education and refinement of taste, and who have had the opportunity, by visiting the North, of knowing what comfort of living means, who have any wants such as people of their station have elsewhere. Mr. Olmsted says of the Alabama planters, for example, “Much the larger portion of the planters of this State live in log-houses, some of them very neat and comfortable, but frequently rude in construction, not *chinked*, with windows unglazed, and wanting in many of the commonest conveniences possessed by the poorest class of Northern farmers and labourers of the older States. Many of those who live in this way possess considerable numbers of slaves, and are every year buying more. Their early frontier life seems to have destroyed all capacity to enjoy the usual luxuries of civilized life.”—(Pp. 575, 576.)

Moreover, at the South, the climate is milder than at the North, the population is more sparse, the towns are smaller (according to the Census of 1860, there were but 13 towns in the whole Confederacy which contained as many as 10,000 inhabitants each, and of these Wheeling, being in Western Virginia, has *seceded* from Secession, and Norfolk, Nashville, Memphis, and New Orleans, being in the hands of the Federal Government, are not likely to be given up); and the style of living in them is more simple and less expensive than in the same class of towns at the North,—and infinitely less luxurious than in the larger Northern cities. And the planters’ families spend most of the year on their plantations, where the style of living is, of course, not such as even in the Southern towns. It will be surely fair to affirm that there are more foreign goods consumed by the inhabitants of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, numbering, with their populous suburbs, considerably more than two millions, than by all the Southern planters combined; and yet the population of these three cities is a very small portion of the inhabitants scattered over the area of the Free States, or congregated in towns varying in population from a few hundreds to two hundred thousand, by whom European goods, of the *better quality*, are in more *common* use, probably, than in Europe itself, because the population, in the mass, feels a greater need for such articles, and is better able to pay for them, than the mass of any European population.

*Secondly*, the *non-slave-holding whites*. In the Slave States, particularly in the Central and Southern Slave States, a white man’s respectability is measured, in a great degree, by the fact of his holding slaves, or not, and by the number of his holding.

Slaves there represent *titles, broad acres*, and "*Consols*," in England. A white man at the South, who owns no slave, is apt to be regarded as rather worse than a "nobody;" the very slaves call him "*white trash*."

Professor Cairnes, of Dublin, in an interesting article published in the *Daily News* of Feb. 3rd and Feb. 9th, 1863, in replying to a criticism of the *Saturday Review*, says, "We know that the '*farming*' population (in contradistinction to the '*planting*' population) of the South, as in the North, consists, for the most part, of peasant proprietors; the land held by such, as a general rule, not exceeding what a single family is competent to cultivate; and, secondly, that when the farms exceed this limit, slave-labour is obtainable and is much preferred by Southern farmers to such free-labour as the country can provide. The owners of five slaves, and upwards, may be taken to represent the *planting*, in contradistinction to the *farming*, interest of the Slave States." The whole number of slaves was about equally divided between these two classes in 1850. "The planters' and farmers' families together numbered about 346,022, while the total number of families employed in farming (including those of hired labourers as well as of proprietors of slaves) did not exceed 339,022. But the total number of white families in the South at this time (1850) was 1,114,687; deducting the former from the latter, there remain 725,665 families over and above what the planting and farming industry, on the most liberal computation of its resources, gave employment to. These 725,665 families, according to the census proportion, would comprise 4,172,574 individuals." Now, how are these millions of whites supported?

Mr. Stirling, a Scotchman, in his most valuable "*Letters from the Slave States*," and also Mr. Olmsted, in the volume from which quotations have already been made, have paid particular attention to this matter.

According to the census of 1850, the number of persons employed in the various manufactories, of whom many undoubtedly were slaves, was 161,725. The foreign and coasting commercial marine of the South, which is not large, would occupy some thousands, perhaps, more. Upon the river steamers, the hands employed are generally slaves, or, if whites, Irishmen chiefly. In the Southern hotels, the domestics are either slaves, or foreign whites, Irishmen or Germans. And the same is also true of all inland routes; as, on the railways, the *employés* are either slaves or Irishmen. In the Southern cities the white labourers are generally foreigners. In the extensive pine-forest districts of North Carolina, where large numbers of persons are employed, the vast majority are slaves.

In the Southern States, excepting in the immediate vicinity

of the larger towns, game is extremely abundant, so that, by hunting and fishing, an ample supply of food can be procured; hence an additional inducement to lead a lazy, unsettled sort of life.

Thus, after deducting from the 4,172,574 whites unprovided for by the agricultural industry of the country, all those for whom we can find occupation in any other way, and adding to the aggregate the increase of poor whites since 1850, we shall have, for *the whole of the Slave States*, say 5,000,000 of whites who have no means of support, such as anywhere else in all the world would be called reputable, or which can be profitable to themselves or the State; and for the States of the *Confederacy*, between three and four millions of such a population.

And the reason of this state of things is that the poor whites are unwilling to labour for their support, because labour is the lot and duty of slaves; hence all the attempts as yet made to establish manufactories at the South have been failures. The native Southern whites will not work in these establishments, and the mechanics who are tempted thither from the Free States are said to be "a curse instead of a blessing; they are generally a worthless, unprincipled class—*enemies to our peculiar institution*, and formidable barriers to the success of our native mechanics."—(From the "*Carolinian*," of South Carolina, quoted by Mr. Olmsted, at p. 511.) That is the difficulty: the "*peculiar institution*" is an enemy of the poor native whites, and looks with suspicion on strangers. According to the census of 1850, there were only 88,109 natives of the Free States in the Slave States now composing the Southern Confederacy; while of natives of the Slave States residing in the Free States, there were not less than 727,088.—(Helper, *op. cit.*, p. 349.)

And the testimony of Southerners themselves as to the wretched condition of this, the larger class of their population, is unanimous and unmistakable. Thus, a Southerner who had resided many years in South Carolina, and who had lately travelled in Spanish America, speaking to Mr. Olmsted of "extensive communities on the banks of the Congaree, in South Carolina," said, "They are the descendants of the former proprietors of nearly all the land of the region; but, for generations, their fathers have been gradually selling off to the richer planters moving in among them, and living on the purchase-money of their lands; and their children have been brought up in listless, aimless, and idle independence, more destructive to them, as a race, than even forced and servile industry might have been. They are more ignorant, their superstitions are more degrading, they are much less enduring and industrious, far less cheerful and animated, and very much more incapable of being improved and elevated, than the most degraded peons of Mexico. Their chief sustenance is a porridge

of cow-peas, and the greatest luxury with which they are acquainted is a stew of bacon and peas, with red pepper, which they call "*Hopping John*."—(Olmsted, *op cit.*, pp. 505, 506.) Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, says, "According to the best calculations which, in the absence of statistics, can be made, it is believed that, of the 300,000 *white* inhabitants of South Carolina, there are not less than 50,000, whose industry, such as it is, and compensated as it is, is not in the present condition of things, *and does not promise hereafter to be*, adequate to procure them, honestly, such a support as every white person in this country is, and feels himself entitled to. Some cannot be said to work at all. They obtain a precarious subsistence by occasional jobs, by hunting, by fishing, sometimes by plundering fields or folds, and too often by what is, in its effects, far worse,—trading with slaves, and seducing them to plunder for their benefit."—(Olmsted, p. 514.) Another person, Mr. William Gregg, in an address delivered before the South Carolina Institute, in 1861, said, "From the best estimates that I have been able to make, I put down the white people who ought to work, and who do not, or who are so employed as to be wholly unproductive to the State, at 125,000."—(Helper, *op. cit.*, p. 404.) Governor Adams, of the same State, in 1855, urged the Legislature to do something towards educating this class, to "save the poor of the State from being hopelessly condemned to ignorance, poverty, and crime."—(Olmsted, p. 505.) A Southern writer in De Bow's "*Resources of the South-West*" declares he has "observed an evident *deterioration* of character in the poor, non-slave-holding whites, the younger portion of them being less educated, less industrious, and in every way less respectable than their ancestors."—(Ellison, *op. cit.*, p. 190.) The Hon. J. H. Lumpkin, of Georgia, speaks of this as "our poor, degraded, half-fed, half-clothed, and ignorant population—without Sabbath-schools, or any other kind of instruction, mental or moral, or without any just appreciation of character."—(Helper, *op. cit.*, p. 405.) Of the poor white population of the pine districts of North Carolina, Mr. Olmsted says, "The negroes are decidedly superior to the great mass of them in every moral and intellectual respect. Among them is a large number, I should think a majority, of entirely uneducated, poverty-stricken vagabonds, I mean people without habitual, definite occupation, or reliable means of livelihood. They are poor, having almost no property but their own bodies; and the use of these, that is, their labour, they are not accustomed to hire out steadily and regularly, so as to obtain capital by wages, but only occasionally by the day or job, when driven to it by necessity. A family of these people will commonly hire, or 'squat' and build, a little log cabin, so made that it is only a shelter from rain, the sides not being chinked, and having no more furniture, or pretension to comfort, than is commonly provided for a criminal in the

cell of a prison. They will cultivate a little corn, and possibly a few roods of potatoes, cow-peas, and coleworts. They will own a few swine, that find a living in the forest; and pretty certainly, also, a rifle and dogs; and the men, ostensibly, occupy most of their time in hunting."—(Olmsted, "*Seaboard Slave States*," pp. 348, 349.)

Such testimonials as the preceding might be multiplied; but enough has been adduced to show the wretched condition and prospects of this class. So far as the relation of the poor whites to the planter class stands, they have never been regarded with any favour by the latter. And the reason of this was given by General Marion to Baron de Kalb, during the Revolutionary War:—"The poor are generally very poor, because, not being necessary to the rich, who have slaves to do all their work, they get no employment from them. Being thus unsupported by the rich, they continue poor and *low-spirited*."—(Olmsted, p. 503.) They have been made use of by the wealthy; they furnished recruits to the Lopez and Walker expeditions; and one can readily understand how they have entered heartily into the actual war. Fighting is to them a more respectable calling than any which is habitual to them in peace; they are brave, daring, and having nothing but their lives to lose, the prospects of gain by the war, the excitements and adventures of a campaign, and the lure held out to them that, when Southern independence should have become achieved, each man would have a farm allotted him by the State, and that slaves should be procurable at a low price—these were inducements enough.

There are very sufficient economical reasons to account for the acknowledged aversion in which the poor whites of the South are held by the planters. It is admitted that the former are generally idle, thoroughly indisposed to labour, and, as a necessary consequence, immoral and dishonest. And their example begets in the slaves who come in contact with them similar vices. Hence the slave-proprietors endeavour, so far as possible, to induce such people to remove from their vicinity, by buying-up their farms, if they have any, or their small plots of land. But these bad qualities of the poor whites are necessary results of the slavery system, and will only be eradicated by the overthrow of this, and then, unfortunately, only by slow degrees, for the opposite qualities are of slow growth.

Another reason for this aversion is significantly stated in the great organ of the slave-holding interest, *De Bow's Review*, in the number for January, 1850. The writer says, "The great mass of our poor white population begins to understand that they have *rights*, and that they, too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon *the suffering*. They are fast learning that there is an almost infinite world of industry opening before them, by

which they can elevate themselves and their families from wretchedness and ignorance to competence and intelligence. *It is this great upheaving of our masses that we have to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*"

The present war will, if anything can, still further open the eyes of those poor whites who survive the conflict, to the fact that their great enemy is not "Northern Abolitionism," but *the peculiar institution* of the South itself, and that their only hope of ever being able to enter into the promised land, this "*infinite world of industry*," lies in the abolition of slavery. Nothing save this can ever accomplish, or render possible, the regeneration of this largest class of the Southern population.

The *free-black* population is so small and so wretched, that it need not delay us: "*worse than a free-nigger*," is what a slave says when he wishes to express a degree of wretchedness which his imagination cannot otherwise picture.

The *slave population* is fed from the South itself, or from the Free States to the North West. It is clothed in coarse woollens and cottons, which can be furnished cheaper from the North, probably, than from England. And, however this war may end, the clothing for the slaves, as well as for the larger part of the white population of the Confederacy, will, probably, continue to be derived from the same source.

Thus, so long as the labour-system of the Confederacy is a servile one, there is no hope of its constituting a profitable market for English industry. It does not contain within itself the elements of vigorous growth and progress, and it is averse to receiving new and better materials from without. The success of the South in this war will still further check prosperity, because the society will become more of a slave-ocracy than before, from the very *prestige* of success. What few seeds of freedom, or rather of opposition to slavery, it may have contained before, will infallibly be destroyed; the poor whites will have been swept away by tens of thousands; the small farmers will have almost disappeared; and the planters will be left amidst their unhappy slaves, and the havoc and desolation of the war. No imagery so well depicts this result of the strife as that which Milton employs to describe the scene disclosed to Satan, when, having been hurled, "with hideous ruin and combustion," from heaven, which he had endeavoured to infect with his crime, he awoke to a full consciousness of his condition, where—

"No light, but rather darkness visible  
Served only to discover sights of woe,  
Regions of sorrow, doleful shades, where peace  
And rest can never dwell, hope never come,  
That comes to all."

The infatuation of the Southern people, their inability to comprehend, or their determination not to be convinced of, the true secret of the comparative slow progress of the South, is inexplicable on any other supposition than that of the old pagans, "Whom the gods wish to destroy, they first blind."

The true explanation has been repeatedly placed before them by their fellow-slaveholders. The comparative cost and profit of free and slave labour has often been proved to be in favour of the former; the fact that *the slaves*, when compensated for their work, are able to accomplish not only their appointed tasks, but to purchase also their own freedom, has been established not only abroad, but even in Louisiana.—(*Revue des deux Mondes*, April, 1863.) That there is nothing in the climate of the South to prevent free white labour, and still less that of emancipated slaves, (who are known to work better as free men than as slaves,) has been conclusively demonstrated.—(Prof. Cairnes, *op. cit.*; Stirling's "Letters;" Mr. Olmsted; Helper, &c. &c.)

The two systems of slave and free labour have been tried almost side by side in Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and in Texas, and also in Missouri, and always to the advantage of the latter.

In Fairfax County, Virginia, the following observations were made in the Agricultural Report of the Commissioner to the Patent Office in Washington:—"In appearance, the county is so changed in many parts, that a traveller who passed over it ten years ago would not now recognise it. Thousands and thousands of acres which had been cultivated in tobacco by the former proprietors would not pay the cost, and were abandoned as worthless, and became covered with a wilderness of pines. These lands have been purchased by Northern emigrants, the large tracts have been divided and sub-divided, and cleared of pines; and neat farm-houses and barns, with smiling fields of grain and grass in the season, salute the delighted gaze of the beholder. Ten years ago it was a mooted question whether Fairfax lands could be made productive. and, if so, would they pay the cost? This problem has been satisfactorily solved by many, and, in consequence of the above altered state of things, *school-houses and churches have doubled in number.*"—(Olmsted, p. 213.) The Convention for the Formation of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, in 1852, adopted an address which acknowledged the striking retrogression of the State:—"Whilst *our population* has increased for the last ten years in a ratio of 11·66 per cent., that of *New York* has increased 27·52 per cent., and that of *Massachusetts* at the still heavier and more startling ratio of 34·81 per cent." With a wide-spread domain, a kindly soil, a climate whose sun radiates fertility, and whose very dews distil abundance, we find our inheritance so wasted, that the

eye aches to behold the prospect.”—(Olmsted, pp. 166–170.) In De Bow’s “*Resources of the South*,” it is said of Georgia, “The native soil of middle Georgia is a rich argillaceous loam, resting on a firm clay foundation. In some of the richer counties, nearly all the land has been cleared and appropriated to tillage, a large maximum of which has been worn out, leaving a desolate picture for the traveller to behold,—decaying tenements, red, old hills, stripped of their native growth and virgin soil, and washed into deep gullies, with here and there patches of Bermuda peas and stunted pine-shrubs struggling for subsistence, on what was once one of the richest soils in America.”—(*Ibid.*, p. 533.)

And so it is in all the Slave States, the new as well as the old; the lands are soon worn out, in consequence of the wretched and exhausting system of agriculture, the planters finding it cheaper to go to new lands and commence upon them afresh, than to allow their old fields to recover by rest, or to restore them by manures or other artificial means; and at the same time the crops which they can profitably cultivate under their system of slave labour are so few, that the plan of rotation is not generally resorted to.—(See Professor Cairnes’ book, in which this subject is well discussed.) Thus, for example, *Alabama* was admitted as a State into the Union in 1819, two hundred years after the colony of Massachusetts Bay was founded. In 1855, the Hon. C. C. Clay, in an address before an Horticultural Society of the State, makes the following striking admissions:—“I can show you with sorrow, in the older portions of Alabama, and in my native county of Madison, the sad memorials of the artless and exhausting culture of cotton. Our small planters, after taking the cream off their lands, unable to restore them by rest, manures, or otherwise, are going further west and south in search of other virgin lands, which they may and will despoil and impoverish in like manner. Our wealthier planters, with greater means and no more skill, are buying out their poorer neighbours, extending their plantations, and adding to their slave force. The wealthy few who are able to live on smaller profits, and to give their blasted fields some rest, are thus pushing off the many, who are merely independent.

“Of the twenty millions of dollars annually realized from the cotton crop of Alabama, nearly all not expended in supporting the producers is re-invested in land and negroes. Thus the white population has decreased and the slave increased, almost *pari passu* in several counties of our State. In 1825, Madison County cast about 3,000 votes; now she cannot give more than 2,300. In traversing that county, one will discover numerous farm-houses, once the abode of industrious and intelligent freemen, now occupied by slaves, or tenantless, deserted, and dilapidated; he will observe fields, once fertile, now unfenced, abandoned, and covered with



those sad harbingers—fox-tail and broom-sedge; he will see the moss growing on the mouldering walls of once thrifty villages, and will find ‘one only master grasps the whole domain,’ that once furnished happy homes for a dozen white families. Indeed, a country in its infancy, where, fifty years ago, scarce a forest-tree had been felled by the axe of the pioneer, is already exhibiting the painful signs of senility and decay apparent in Virginia and the Carolinas; the freshness of its agricultural glory is gone, the vigour of its youth is extinct, and the spirit of desolation seems brooding over it.”—(Olmsted, pp. 576, 577.)

The same melancholy picture may be drawn of *Texas*,—the most recent and perhaps, naturally, the richest Slave State. Mr. Olmsted (himself a farmer) says, “I hold myself justified in asserting that the natural elements of wealth in the soil of Texas will have been more exhausted in ten years, and with them the rewards offered by Providence to labour will have been more lessened than without slavery would have been the case in two hundred.....After two hundred years’ occupation of similar soils by a free-labouring community, I have seen no such evidences of waste as in Texas I have seen after ten years of slavery. Waste of soil and injudicious application of labour are common in the agriculture of the North; but nowhere is the land, with what is attached to it, now less promising and suited for the residence of a refined and civilized people than it was before the operations, which have been attended with the alleged waste, were commenced.”—(Quoted by Professor Cairnes, p. 78.)

From the very character of the slave population, ignorant, wasteful, careless, indifferent to the interest of the masters, and from the idleness and actual aversion to labour of the white population, because it is looked upon as a servile occupation and duty, there can be no varied industry at the South. Agriculture monopolizes almost all the capital and industry of the Slave States. Manufacturers have not flourished as a general rule in those States, excepting in those portions of them where slavery is not the predominant system of labour; and, probably, the reasons are that the *slaves* are not intelligent enough, generally, and those who are so are not cheap enough to make their employment in factories profitable, as competitors with the Northern establishments; white mechanics, from the Northern States, do not relish working in Slave States, and *Southern whites* will not work.

According to the Census Report of 1850, in the States now constituting the Southern Confederacy, the total value of manufactures of all sorts was £15,953,656; in the other States, for the same year, £192,631,731; and this, notwithstanding that in the Slave States there are several millions of white persons who have nothing to do of a reputable nature, and notwithstanding that these States

abound in the raw products of agriculture, in wood and coal, in mineral treasures, and in water-power. If anything could be manufactured advantageously at the South, it should be cotton; the cotton manufactories of the Confederacy, in 1860, consumed 74,320 bales; in the remaining States the consumption was 566,860 bales.

The South points with triumph to her tobacco and cotton crops, the latter especially, as being the great regulator of foreign exchange for our country; and it is an immense product, a most wonderful product, worth, in 1859, about £40,000,000. And one great merit of this crop is, that it has made the world almost dependent upon the South for it. But there is an elasticity, a recuperative power, in the Free States of our Union, and of Europe, especially of England, which rises superior to this dependence, and which opens up resources and compensations when cotton fails; which has enabled England to reduce her rate of taxation in the very time of greatest dearth of cotton. And so in our country, this same truth is seen in the fact that, during the year 1862, *the second year of the war*, the exports from the port of New York alone (when cotton was imported to New York from Europe, and not a bale, perhaps, was sent away) amounted to about £1,000,000 more than the entire exports of the whole South during the year 1859, when the cotton crop alone was estimated at £40,000,000. The value of the exports from New York harbour alone during the last four years shows the resiliency of the Free States under the immense pressure of the war, the greatest amount, it will be noticed, having been exported in 1862, the second year of the war. In 1859, £27,539,237; in 1860, £29,136,690; in 1861, £24,966,230; in 1862, £43,274,368.—(Bigelow, *op. cit.*)

Cotton stands third in value on the list of agricultural products of America.

In 1850, the value of the Indian Corn Crop was £59,207,110

"	"	Wheat	"	"	20,097,188
"	"	Cotton	"	"	19,720,744
"	"	Hay	"	"	19,375,254

In 1860, cotton was *fourth* on the list, and hardly escaped being *the fifth*.

Value of Indian Corn crop, 1860.....£99,654,204

"	Wheat	"	"	.....	51,355,014
"	Hay	"	"	.....	42,849,246
"	Cotton	"	"	.....	33,267,692
"	Oats	"	"	.....	32,526,444

It will be of assistance, in estimating the comparative ability of the two sections to sustain the burthens of taxation necessitated by the

war, and which must continue to be borne subsequently, to bear in mind the condition of the Confederacy as already described and to be further presented. To the United States, these burthens will be comparatively easily sustained. The public debt of the United States will be as small a "*flea-bite*" to her as the £800,000,000 public debt of Great Britain to the United Kingdom, and this was the estimate of an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer. Notwithstanding the war, and the operation of the "*Atrocious Morrill Tariff*," the Customs receipts for 1862 have exceeded those of 1860 by \$15,000,000; and the proceeds of the tax-bills recently passed have already amounted to the rate of \$150,000,000 annually; without any complaint of unwillingness to pay, or inability to collect them. The public debt is between \$800,000,000 and \$900,000,000.

Amongst other agreeable prospects held out to us from England in the event of Southern success, is that of a further disintegration of the Union. But in the *Southern Congress*, the doctrine of independent State rights (recognised by the Confederate Constitution) has already been openly proclaimed, and with difficulty hushed; and Southern independence gained, the *centrifugal* will perhaps be found stronger than the *centripetal* forces of the States of the Confederacy.

At all events, so far as our ability to pay our debts is concerned, we have all the encouragements and lights derivable from English history, and they are numerous. In fact, the Secretary of the United States Treasury has succeeded in securing the passage of a banking which resembles the English Bill of Sir Robert Peel, and this, in turn, was taken partly from the New York Banking Law—so that we are not such financial *ignoramus* as the *Times* would have our English friends to believe.

A very capable American writer has recently drawn the attention of his countrymen, for their encouragement, to the experience of England during her long war with Napoleon. ("*How a Free People carry on a Long War*." By C. J. Stilli, Esq., of Philadelphia.) The financial lesson taught us is very hopeful. Mr. Stilli says that, about the beginning of the Peninsular War, the annual exports of Great Britain fell from £57,000,000 to £23,000,000, the income-tax rose to 10 per cent., and specific war-taxes were imposed to the amount of more than £20,000,000; notwithstanding, the public debt accumulated during the war to more than £1,000,000,000. "Discontent and violence among the labouring classes became universal, and it was remarked that the greatest victories in Spain were celebrated in England 'amidst a population who had been prevented, by the burden of taxation on the absolute necessities of life, from securing a livelihood by the strictest industry.' The public stocks had sunk to such a degree, that the 3 per cents, which are now always above 90, were rarely higher during the war

than 65; and so depressed at last had the public credit become, that the final loan of the Continental war, that of April, 1815, was taken by the contractor at 53 per cent., and paid for in the depreciated paper of the day; and yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer was complimented, even by the Opposition, for having made so good an operation. The Bank was in a state of chronic suspension, the buying and selling of gold were prohibited to the public under severe penalties, and yet every gold guinea sent by the Government to pay the army in Spain cost 30 per cent. premium."—(Pp. 26, 27.) This was 30 per cent. *above the Mint price of gold.* In New York, in January last, gold was sold at only 48 per cent. *above the "legal tender" notes.*

Thus, it appears to me, from an examination into the condition of the three great classes of the Southern population, its social and industrious economy, the comparatively little progress which the country is making, as a whole, and the actual retrogression of many parts of it, that the prospect of gain to the British nation from free-trade with the Southern Confederacy is gloomy. It would have been far wiser *policy* for England to have given the aid of her moral support and encouragement to the maintenance of the Union.

But, as regards free-trade with the South, "it takes two to make a bargain," and the South cannot and will not listen to such a proposition, always supposing, of course, that she secure her independence.

We have seen that the South always favoured a tariff for *revenue*, even when she had no industrial interest to foster, excepting the agricultural, and when the whole resources of the nation were at her disposition. But when she will have her coast to light, her harbours to keep in order, her custom-house establishment to maintain, her post-office system to support, her army (which will be large, probably) to pay, her foreign diplomatic and consular staff to provide for, her civil functionaries at home to salary, and a thousand and one other "horse-leech's daughters" constantly crying out "give, give," to satisfy,—where is all the money to come from? And think of the immense debt she has been running up, herself and her component States, the latter having already begun their new career in a state of considerable embarrassment—some of them. Besides all this, she must have a navy, and to have a navy, she must have a commercial marine; and to get this she must encourage ship-builders and shippers at home,—no longer the Mersey, Clyde, and Co. gentlemen, who are now so desirous of helping her, trusting to be allowed to help themselves to the good things of the South, when the latter shall have, by their aid, won her independence. In short, the South will consult her own interests, and will do precisely as England did when England was young—she will

favour and protect her own commerce. The taxes, alas! must be heavy; and the whole burthen of taxation will fall upon the planters and farmers, the poor whites having no possessions taxable, excepting, perhaps, their own bodies, and hitherto they have been unwilling to make these profitable. The planters and farmers, chiefly the former, will be the law-makers, and, naturally enough, they will endeavour to legislate as small burthens as possible upon themselves. They will make their friends contribute to their support; and as England is the wealthiest friend they have, and the one who has shown them the most sympathy and friendship in their struggle for independence, they will expect a continued manifestation of the same willingness to aid them. They will *roundly* tax the *cotton* which England takes from them, and the English ships which carry it away. They will not heavily tax the goods which England sends them, provided they *need* these, and cannot get them cheaper elsewhere, which latter will be somewhat doubtful, considering the comparative distance between New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and the Southern ports, and the latter and England. In short, instead of the old "*saw*," "*money makes the mare go*," it will be, *cotton makes the South go*. Cotton will be taxed *necessarily*, and the few other articles of export which the South can produce for European markets; but *cotton* chiefly, because this is, to a certain extent, an indispensable commodity.

In the end, therefore, English hopes of a lucrative free-trade with the South will prove to be of "such stuff as dreams are made of." And some future number of *Punch* will amuse the world by picturing that "*artful dodger*," John Bull, being "taken in and done for" by his dear friend; and another, showing how "*Johnny upset the coach*" of the United States, hoping to get a little booty thereby, but came out of the crash with a broken leg. And all the world will say, "*Served him right!*"

The comparative amount and rate of *improvement* from year to year in the Free States and in the Slave States has always been a subject of remark with travellers. "Let a man," says Mr. Olmsted, "be absent twenty years from almost any part of the North, and he will be impressed on his return by what we call the '*improvements*' which have been made—better buildings, churches, school-houses, mills, railways, &c. In New York city alone, for instance, at least \$200,000,000 have been re-invested merely in an improved housing of the people; in labour-saving machinery, water-works for the supply of the city, gas-works, &c., as much more. It is not difficult to see where the profits of our manufacturers and merchants are. Again, go into the country, and there is no end of substantial proof of twenty years of agricultural prosperity, not alone in roads, canals, bridges, dwellings, barns, and fences, but in books, furniture, gardens, and in the better dress and evidently higher education of



the people. But where will the returning traveller see the accumulated cotton profits of twenty years in Mississippi? Ask the cotton-planter for them, and he will point in reply not to dwellings, libraries, churches, school-houses, mills, railways, or anything of the kind: he will point to his negroes, and to almost nothing else." —(Olmsted, *Journeys*, &c., vol. i., p. 25.) This is the testimony of a Northern traveller, but of one who is remarkably well qualified to judge of the facts, and who has enjoyed abundant opportunities of collecting them; and it agrees perfectly with the acknowledgments of Southerners themselves, as we have fully shown.

A Southern authority, quoted in De Bow's *Resources of the South and West*, says, "If any one unacquainted with the condition of the South-west were told that the cotton-growing district alone had sold the crop for \$50,000,000 annually for the last twenty years, he would naturally conclude that this must be the richest community in the world. But what would be his surprise when told that, so far from living in palaces, many of the planters dwell in habitations of the most primitive construction, and these so ill-built as to be incapable of defending their occupants from the wind and rain; that, instead of any artistic improvement, these rude dwellings are surrounded by cotton-fields, or, probably, by fields exhausted, washed into gullies, and abandoned; that, instead of canals being constructed, the navigable streams even remain unimproved, to the great detriment of transportation; that the common roads of the country are scarcely passable; that the edifices erected for the purposes of learning and religion are frequently built of logs, and roofed merely with boards."

What is done, then, with the proceeds of this immense cotton crop? The answer is easy, and it will explain the absence of comfort all over the cotton-growing districts of the Slave States.

The chief product of slave-labour raised *for sale* is cotton. The total number of slaves engaged in cotton culture was estimated by Mr. De Bow, in 1850, at 1,800,000, and the aggregate cotton crop at 2,400,000 bales, making a bale and a-third for each slave. This was the largest crop between 1846 and 1852. Other things being equal, the smaller the estate of slaves, the less is their rate of production per head. The number of slaves on cotton plantations held by owners of fifty slaves and upwards is estimated at 420,000. If these produce on an average only two and a-half bales per head, (men, women, and children,) it leaves an average for the small plantations of seven-eighths of a bale per head. These small plantations are chiefly in the interior, with long haulage and boatage to market, the wealthy planters having bought up all the more advantageously-situated land. To the small planter in the interior, his cotton-crop does not realize, as an average plantation price,

more than seven cents per pound, or thirty dollars per bale. Deducting those who hold slaves only as domestic servants from the whole number of slaveholders, more than half of the latter, and fully half of all the cotton-planters, own each not more than one family, on an average, of *five slaves* of all ages. The ordinary total cash income, then, in time of peace, of fully half of our cotton-planters, cannot be estimated at more than \$125, or, in extraordinary years, at more than \$150. With this they must purchase whatever clothing and other necessaries they require for the yearly supply of an average of ten persons, (five whites and five slaves,) as well as provide tools, mechanics' work and materials, and whatever else may be requisite to carry on the culture of a plantation, pay the fees of physicians, lawyers, clergymen, (if they indulge in such luxuries,) their state, county, and municipal taxes, and the expenses of education, if any, &c., &c. Consequently, a majority of those who produce the cotton-crop of the country must be miserably poor—poorer than the mass of our day-labourers at the North.

A similar calculation will show that the planters who own, on an average, *two slave families* each, (*ten slaves*.) can scarcely raise more than \$300 worth of cotton annually. "I have seen," says Mr. Olmsted, "many a workman's lodging at the North, and in England also, where there was double the amount of luxury that I ever saw in a regular cotton-planter's house, on plantations worked by three slave families."

The next class of planters for which the census furnishes data for special consideration are those whose slaves occupy, on an average, *seven cabins*, each containing five slaves, say, including house-servants, aged persons and invalids and children. It is doubtless true, that cotton is cultivated on many plantations of this class, so as to produce a handsome return for the capital invested; but it is not the case with the majority of such.

Upon plantations worked by a larger number of slave families, *ten or more*, says Mr. Olmsted, "there are advantages for the cultivation, cleansing, pressing, shipping, and selling of cotton, by the aid of which the planter obtains a large return for his capital. The whole number of slave-owners of this class in all the Slave States is, according to Mr. De Bow, 7,929, among which are all the great sugar, rice, cotton, and tobacco-planters; *less than 7,000, certainly, are cotton-planters*. A large majority of these live, when they reside on their plantations at all, in districts, almost the only white population of which consists of owners and overseers of the same class of plantations. The nearest other whites will be some sand-hill vagabonds, between whom and the planters intercourse is neither intimate nor friendly."—(Olmsted, *Journeys*, &c., vol. i., pp. 8-27.)

It is evident, therefore, that the vast majority of the cotton-

producers, whose aggregate revenue is so large, have, individually, very little money to expend upon anything beyond the merest necessities; and the wealthy planters who can afford luxuries, and who are possessed of refinement and education, find themselves compelled to seek out of the Slave States those conditions which refinement and education need for their own cultivation and enjoyment, and which wealth alone cannot purchase at home. Add to this, too, the fact that, owing to the sparseness of the Southern white population, the character of that population, the low grade of civilization which characterizes it, and the very limited range of Southern industry, a considerable portion of the revenue of all the planters is necessarily expended abroad in the purchase of a thousand necessary articles for domestic and agricultural uses which the South cannot supply. Hence, notwithstanding its apparent wealth, the South is poor, and *the cause of her poverty is, beyond cavil or doubt, Slavery*; and so long as Slavery exist, she can never be any thing but poor, and hopelessly poor.

But there are many circumstances in favour of the loyal States of America, as compared with the financial condition of England during the Peninsular War. Her population was then but little more than half of ours. Her chief industry then, as now, was manufacturing, ours is both manufacturing and agricultural. The average annual expenditure of England during the last four years of the war, exclusive of the charge on the public debt, was about £90,000,000; ours, including the payment on the debt, is about the same; her debt amounted at the end of the war to more than four times the sum to which ours has, as yet, reached; her exports fell off almost three-fifths, ours, on the contrary, are steadily increasing, notwithstanding the war. The aggregate of real and personal property in England was much less than ours is now (it was estimated by Joseph Lowe at \$10,698,600,000 in 1823; while ours, in 1860, was \$10,659,418,009, of the loyal States alone). The larger portion of the English expenditures was made in foreign countries, to subsidize other governments and to pay her own troops fighting abroad. Our expenditures are almost entirely at home. To make up for this continued drain of the precious metals from her own shores, England was obliged to issue paper-money for domestic uses; while we are receiving more than £1,000,000 of gold monthly from California, besides the paper-money issued; and by the Banking Bill recently passed, not only is a more uniform currency established for the whole country, but it also creates a new bond of union between the Government and the people, inasmuch as the Government securities constitute, in a large measure, the basis of the general currency, in the stability of which all classes are directly interested; and the Government derives a profit from the banking operations of the country.



The following Tables will show the absolute and comparative yield of all the Free and all the Slave States in 1850. They are taken from Helper's volume, which gets them from the United States' Census Reports :—

PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE.	FREE STATES.		SLAVE STATES.		Estimated Price.
	Bushels.	Value in dollars.	Bushels.	Value in dollars.	
Wheat .....	72,157,486	108,236,229	27,893,426	41,840,139	At 1-50
Oats .....	96,690,371	38,636,148	49,882,973	19,953,189	" 40
Indian Corn .....	242,618,650	145,571,190	348,992,271	209,395,362	" 60
Potatoes .....	59,033,130	22,432,689	44,847,240	16,042,019	" 38
Rye .....	12,574,623	12,574,623	1,608,420	1,608,240	" 100
Barley .....	5,002,013	4,501,811	161,907	145,716	" 90
Buckwheat....	8,550,245	4,275,122	405,847	202,673	" 50
Peas and Beans	1,542,075	2,697,631	7,637,228	13,365,149	" 1-75
Clover and Grass Seeds }	762,265	2,286,795	123,507	370,521	" 3-00
Flax Seeds....	358,923	448,647	203,384	254,230	" 1-25
Garden Pro- ducts..... }	..	3,714,610	..	1,377,260	..
Orchard Pro- ducts..... }	..	6,332,911	..	1,355,827	..
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>499,189,781</b>	<b>351,708,306</b>	<b>481,755,703</b>	<b>305,910,325</b>	<b>..</b>
Hay .....	28,427,799,680	142,138,998	2,548,636,160	12,743,180	at ½ cent.
Hemp .....	443,520	22,176	77,667,520	3,883,376	" 5 "
Hops .....	3,463,176	519,476	33,780	5,067	" 15 "
Flax .....	3,048,278	304,827	4,766,208	476,620	" 10 "
Maple Sugar..	32,161,799	2,572,943	2,088,687	167,094	" 8 "
Tobacco .....	14,752,087	1,475,208	184,983,906	18,498,390	" 10 "
Wool .....	39,647,211	13,876,523	12,797,329	4,479,066	" 35 "
Butter and Cheese .... }	349,860,803	52,479,120	68,634,234	10,295,135	" 15 "
Beeswax and Honey .... }	6,888,368	1,033,255	7,964,780	1,194,717	" 15 "
Cotton .....	..	..	978,311,600	78,264,928	" 8 "
Cane Sugar ..	..	..	237,133,000	16,699,310	" 7 "
Rice (rough)..	..	..	215,813,497	8,612,539	" 4 "
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>Quantity in lbs.</b> <b>28,878,064,922</b>	<b>214,422,526</b>	<b>Quantity in lbs.</b> <b>4,338,330,701</b>	<b>155,219,421</b>	
Agricultural } Products. } Grand } Total }		566,130,832	..	461,129,746	
Value of Live Stock .....		286,374,541	..	253,723,687	
Value of Animals Slaughtered		56,990,247	..	54,388,377	
Value of Farms, Farming } Implements, and Machi- nery .....		2,233,058,619	..	1,182,995,274	
<b>TOTAL.....</b>		<b>2,576,423,407</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>1,491,105,338</b>	

Value of Slaves @ 400 dollars.....1,280,145,600

Wheat crop of Kentucky in 1840	..4,803,152 bushels ;	of Rye	..1,321,373
Do.	do. 1850..2,142,842 do.	do.	415,073
Decrease.....	2,660,330 do.	Decrease .....	906,300

Do.	Tennessee in 1840	..4,569,692 do. ;	of Tobacco, 29,550,432 lbs.
Do.	do. 1850	..1,619,386 do.	do. 20,148,932 "
Decrease.....	2,950,306 do.	Decrease ....	9,401,500 "

Rye crop of Virginia in 1840	....1,482,799 do.	of Tobacco	..75,347,106 "
Do.	do. 1850 .... 458,930 do.	do.	56,803,227 "
Decrease.....	1,022,869	Decrease ....	18,533,879 "

Comparative yield, in 1849-50, of Virginia, a Slave State settled in 1607, and of Ohio, a Free State admitted into the Union only in 1802 :—

Acres improved Land.	Bushels Corn.	Lbs. Tobacco.	Total value of both.	Yield per acre.
				Bush. Corn. lbs. Tobacco.
Virginia ..	10,360,135	..35,254,319	..56,803,227	..\$3,564,639,385.....18.....630
Ohio ....	9,851,493	..59,078,695	..10,454,449	..\$5,127,223,565.....36.....730

—(Olmsted, " *Journeys*," &c., vol. II., p. 255.)

Showing the comparative value of land in Free and Slave States :—

In 1854, acres of land assessed in S. Carolina	..17,289,359—in New Jersey	5,324,800
Valued at .....	\$22,836,374	do. \$153,161,619
Average value per acre .....	\$1-32	Per acre....\$28-76

In 1856, acres of land assessed in New York	..30,080,000—in N. Carolina	32,450,560
Valued at .....	\$1,112,133,136	do. \$98,800,636
Average value per acre .....	\$36-97	Per acre....\$3-06

#### VALUE OF FARMS.

In Virginia .....	(a Slave State, settled in 1607)	.....	\$8 per acre.
In Pennsylvania..	(a Free State do. 1682)	.....	25 do.
In New Jersey ..	(do. do. 1624)	.....	44 do.

—Olmsted, " *Journeys*," &c.

## SHOWING THE COMPARATIVE WEALTH OF PRINCIPAL CITIES.

FREE STATES.	Population.	Wealth.	Per head.
New York .....	700,000	\$511,740,492	\$731
Philadelphia .....	600,000	325,000,000	660
Boston .....	165,000	249,162,500	1,510
Brooklyn .....	225,000	95,800,440	425
Cincinnati .....	210,000	88,810,734	422
Chicago .....	112,000	171,000,000	1,527
Providence .....	60,000	68,064,516	967
Buffalo .....	90,000	45,474,476	605
New Bedford .....	21,000	27,047,000	1,288

  

SLAVE STATES.	Population.	Wealth.	Per head.
Baltimore .....	250,000	\$102,053,839	\$408
New Orleans .....	175,000	91,188,195	521
St. Louis .....	140,000	63,000,000	450
Charleston .....	60,000	36,127,751	602
Louisville .....	70,000	31,500,000	450
Richmond .....	40,000	20,143,520	503
Norfolk .....	17,000	12,000,000	705
Savannah .....	25,000	11,999,015	480
Wilmington .....	10,000	7,850,000	785

The following Table, arranged from the Census Reports of the year ending July 1st, 1860, shows the comparative agricultural yield of the United States and the States constituting the Southern Confederacy. The price per bushel and per pound is taken at the same as in the preceding Table, for want of more accurate information. The entire State of Virginia is counted as belonging to the Confederacy.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.	UNITED STATES.		CONFEDERACY.	
	Bushels.	Value in dollars.	Bushels.	Value in dollars.
Wheat .....	139,816,487	209,724,730.50	31,366,894	47,050,341.00
Oats ..	152,634,280	61,053,712.00	19,920,408	7,968,163.20
Indian Corn .....	549,786,693	329,872,015.80	280,665,014	168,399,008.40
Potatoes .....	107,889,769	40,998,112.22	44,287,734	16,829,339.22
Rye .....	18,803,255	18,803,255.00	2,173,033	2,173,033.00
Barley .....	15,454,812	13,909,330.80	180,337	162,303.30
Buckwheat .....	17,224,040	8,612,020.00	440,874	240,437.00
Peas and Beans .....	3,633,337	6,358,339.75	11,554,676	20,220,683.00
Clover and Grass Seeds ..	1,674,295	5,022,885.00	60,240	180,720.00
Flax Seeds .....	550,607	688,258.75	61,320	76,650.00
Garden Products .....	..	13,449,743.00	..	2,091,284.00
Orchard Products .....	..	16,902,343.00	..	2,857,008.00
TOTAL.....	..	725,394,745.82	..	268,248,970.10

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.	UNITED STATES.		CONFEDERACY.	
	Weight in lbs.	Value in dollars.	Weight in lbs.	Value in dollars.
Hay .....	40,454,052,800	202,270,264,00	2,395,193,920	11,975,969,60
Hemp .....	222,149,760	111,07,488,00	10,549,600	527,480,00
Hops.....	10,993,996	1,649,099,40	16,016	2,402,40
Flax .....	2,910,510	291,051,00	872,549	87,254,90
Maple Sugar .....	37,773,033	3,021,842,64	1,090,851	87,268,08
Tobacco .....	230,369,341	23,036,934,10	199,021,430	19,902,143,00
Wool .....	50,760,641	17,766,224,35	9,750,702	3,414,805,70
Butter and Cheese .....	497,284,560	74,592,684,00	69,100,429	10,365,064,35
Beeswax and Honey.....	14,774,599	2,216,189,85	11,612,256	1,741,838,40
Cotton (ginned) .....	2,172,400	173,792,00	2,077,058,400	166,164,672,00
Cane Sugar.....	283,000	19,810,00	301,922,000	21,134,540,00
Rice .....	38,313	1,532,50	187,157,721	7,486,308,84
TOTAL .....	..	336,146,911,84	..	242,887,747,27
Agricultural Total..	..	1,061,541,657,66	..	511,136,717,37

Value of agricultural products *in favour of* United States  
\$550,404,940,29.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS. (Value not mentioned.)	UNITED STATES.	CONFEDERACY.
Sorghum Molasses .....	5,919,784 gallons.	1,315,241 gallons.
Cane do. ....	66 do.	16,337,014 do.
Maple do. ....	1,634,179 do.	310,415 do.
Wine .....	1,648,386 do.	220,622 do.

STATISTICS OF PROPERTY.	UNITED STATES.	CONFEDERACY.
Acres of Improved Land.....	72,276,577	57,092,613
Cash Value of Farms .....	4,779,933,587 dols.	1,870,938,920 dols.
Value of Farming Implements .....	163,033,553 do.	83,993,793 do.
Value of Live Stock.....	716,527,942 do.	390,962,274 do.
Value of Real Estate and Personal Property .....	10,457,452,961 do.	5,602,166,107 do.
Value of Animals Slaughtered .....	131,389,352 do.	81,542,301 do.

## General Statistics of Manufactures, 1860.

	United States.	Confederacy.*
No. Factories .....	110,274	13,126
Capital Invested.....	\$949,335,000	\$100,665,000
Raw Materials and Fuel Consumed ..	\$929,391,000	\$82,608,000
Value of Annual Products .....	\$1,763,649,920	\$146,360,000
No. of Hands employed .....	1,274,890	110,110

## Banking Statistics, 1860.\*

	United States.	Confederacy.
Capital .....	\$332,841,996	\$113,128,621
Specie .....	56,333,962	27,260,585
Specie-funds .....	18,203,898	1,138,123
Circulation .....	147,643,192	69,459,265
Loans and Discounts .....	643,991,037	142,964,643
Deposits .....	210,922,817	42,879,312

\* Arranged from the American Almanack for 1861, p. 231.

## SPECIAL MANUFACTURING STATISTICS, 1860.

	No. of Factories		Raw Materials.		No. of Persons Employed.		Cost of Labor.		Value of Product.		[CAPITAL INVESTED.	
	U. States.	Confed.	U. States.	Confederacy.	U. States.	Confed.	U. States.	Confederacy.	U. States.	Confederacy.	U. States.	Confederacy.
Flour and Meal .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	\$192,376,912	\$30,767,467	..	..
Agricultural Implements ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16,204,816	1,682,483	..	..
Steam Engines & Machinery	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	43,057,747	4,069,803	..	..
Iron Founding Products....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	26,042,294	2,604,382	..	..
Sawed and Planed Lumber..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	78,001,124	17,941,165	..	..
Sewing Machines .....	10,906	938	667,831	1,097,461	2,196	2,825	\$1,063,236	\$806,928	6,606,345	2,729,327	\$1,390,250	..
Boot and Shoe-making ..	2,799	..	42,623,977	..	123,602	..	30,733,628	..	86,820,673	..	21,160,849	..
Clothing Establishments ..	772	31	36,239,564	..	88,660	..	16,994,009	..	68,002,975	..	21,964,700	..
India-rubber Goods .....	..	..	2,760,911	..	2,883	..	801,600	..	6,729,900	..	3,661,600	..
Cotton Goods .....	31	143	61,087,801	4,906,964	108,632	10,278	21,888,752	1,471,416	107,964,628	7,172,293	90,247,644	9,303,921
Woolen Goods .....	1,662	277	39,242,698	1,317,602	18,660	1,670	17,372,201	256,676	68,562,660	2,303,303	34,202,647	1,317,980
Soap and Candles .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16,470,629	489,913	..	..
Home-made Fabrics .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9,996,922	14,362,340	..	..
TOTAL .....	16,190	1,378	162,422,792	7,322,017	343,623	14,673	87,863,326	2,534,020	722,835,605	83,922,443	176,517,390	11,511,936

## Railway Statistics, 1860.

	United States.	Confederacy.		United States.	Confederacy.
No. of Miles	21,846,77	8,946,90	Total No. ....	3,048	844
Cost .....	\$917,134,732	\$237,426,097	Annual Circulation	834,910,112	103,041,436

## Newspapers and Periodicals, 1860.

## Canals in 1858.\*

	United States.	Confederacy.
No. of Miles	4,607	566

## Finances of the States, as States, 1860.\*

	United States.	Confederacy.
Income .....	\$24,305,051	\$17,330,746
Expenditure ..	23,662,650	17,593,061
Debt .....	150,739,694	113,489,200

\* Ellison, *op. cit.*, pp. 363, 364.

## Foreign Commerce, 1859, 1860.†

	United States.	Confederacy.
Tonnage .....	4,750,179	351,797
Exports .....	\$178,004,334	\$178,340,776
Imports .....	315,522,166	23,230,831
Total Foreign Trade..	\$493,526,500	\$201,571,607

† Arranged from Ellison, *op. cit.*, p. 368.

## Comparative Statistics of Public Schools. ‡

	United States.	Confederacy.
Square miles of Territory .....	728,757	763,606
Population—1850-55 .....	18,958,469	7,501,549
No. of Children between 5 and 20 years old.....	5,503,716	1,970,535
No. of Pupils at Public Schools .....	3,749,754	557,978
Annual Expense of Public Schools .....	\$18,312,011	\$1,847,346

‡ Arranged from Bigelow, *op. cit.*, p. 420. It is based upon the Census Reports from 1850-55. Thirty-one States only are included in the Report, that being the number of the States of the Union at that date. The Territories not counted.

From these comparative statements, one may see at a glance how few have been the available means of improvement which the South has brought to bear upon the condition of her population. From all the preceding pages, one may learn how opposed to all real progress is the whole policy of the South. She boasts of being an *agricultural* country; yet in this very field of her choice, and to which she has devoted all her energies and industry, she has been left far behind by the Free States. There can be but one cause for this inferiority, and that cause is *slavery*. God has blessed the South with natural advantages of soil and climate greater than those which the Free States possess. And we may imagine, from the abilities, the patient courage and endurance, and the zeal, which her population is now displaying, in a bad cause, what this people might accomplish were all these noble qualities rightly directed.

And why should England, *of all countries in the world*, do any-

thing to aid the present enterprise in which the South is engaged, and thus perpetuate slavery? The South always has been, and must ever be, an enemy to England, provided the latter continue to be opposed to slavery, and provided, too, the South continue to be built on slavery as a "corner-stone." That the South, if she become independent, with her present extent of territory, will ever voluntarily abolish slavery, we have shown to be more than improbable. But for the present, while the struggle between freedom and slavery is at issue, let England and Englishmen hold aloof. God knows, the North did not desire war, but sought peace, even up to the very edge of battle. The South drew the sword. And now the grand question which, ever since our national existence began, has baffled all efforts at peaceful solution, is being subjected to a sterner tribunal. If the "*to be, or not to be,*" of slavery shall not be decided now, it must come up again at some future time, and when the triumphant South shall have organized and consolidated all her powers for offensive and defensive war. It is one of those great and vital questions which will not be always set aside for "a more convenient season;" it is the head of the murdered Banquo, which will not "*keep down*" at the bidding of any earthly power; it is the ominous skeleton which will obtrude itself at the feasts of nations; it is the black cloud which will ever and anon sweep athwart the sunshine of the world, presaging tempests. If possible, let it be settled, and well settled, now and for ever. It has been thrust upon us by the South herself, at the bidding of a mightier Power. It is right that the two parties most immediately interested in its solution should be left to settle it, in the only way now possible, viz., by fighting it out to the end. Let enlightened Europe give to the champion of freedom, in this struggle, all the aid of its moral support. England, especially, has no call to aid the South. Even during the continuance of the war, England has amassed a surplus of revenue, and has been enabled to reduce her taxation; by God's blessing, her prospects of an ample harvest are bright and promising, and she is gradually freeing herself from her dependence upon the South for her supply of cotton for her most numerous class of operatives. Her cotton-workers are, it is true, suffering, but how can they be most cheaply, most justly, and most permanently relieved? Not by a war in favour of the South (as any war with the United States, under present circumstances, would necessarily be); not by encouraging the establishment of Southern independence, for, at best, this would be but a temporary respite; a cotton dearth would occur at some future time, and when England will probably be less able to encounter it afresh. England is wealthy, and her population is famed for its large liberality; let a portion of the wealth which has been made from the toil of the slave be consecrated, as an expiatory sacrifice, to the alleviation of

the sufferings which England's complicity with American slavery has, at length, by a just retribution, brought upon herself. Let not England, nor Englishmen, to aid in the establishment of Slavery, or, (which would really conduce to this end,) to accomplish some selfish vision of political and commercial advantage, add one feather's weight to the dreadful load of trials which a kindred people—kindred in language, in literature, in laws, in civilization, in religion, and in interests and friendship—has been made to bear.

If the South shall win her independence, bearing away those States which now constitute the Southern Confederacy,—and, still more, if she draw away with these other States and territories,—then, indeed, may the friends of humanity stand aghast. An oligarchy, (if it do not assume some still more exclusive polity,) which has already exhibited great skill in civil and military administration; possessing a domain nearly four times as large as that of France, with a population of five millions of whites, most of them ignorant and careless of the profitable pursuits of peace, endowed with all the qualities of the soldier in a pre-eminent degree, and now inured and trained to war; having besides an immense body of slaves to provide supplies for the military population, and to produce that great staple which has made the world almost tributary,—this tremendous power will march out upon the stage to take her place amongst the nations. Mahomet came to establish a new form of religious faith; but the Southern Confederacy comes to found and propagate a despotism vastly more fatal to religion and humanity. And she will possess the energy and the power to carry out her purpose, or to wage fierce war against whomsoever she may find to oppose her.

But if the Rebellion be overcome, and if Federal supremacy be re-established in the original spirit of the Federal Constitution, as expounded by its framers, and as since restored to it, what better can England desire either for her own interests, or for those of America and the negro race? As to *subjugation*, no one dreams of it. The South will occupy the same position as before in the Federal councils and legislative halls. The only cause of dissidence and hostility between the two sections, that which, as the South admits, produced the Rebellion, will have been removed. Then let North and South together devote their re-united energies and their undivided resources to the reparation of the evils occasioned by the war, and to the recompensing of the negro for all the accumulated wrongs which their common injustice and cupidity have heaped upon his race.

Or, if the South shall fail to accomplish her entire purpose and hope in rebelling, but shall succeed in withdrawing only the States to the east of the Mississippi from the Union, and shall attempt to carry on an independent Government with these, then, so far as



slavery is concerned, there will still be hope. For within such limitations, Southern independence will be short-lived. The Southern Confederacy will not then possess the elements of national vitality. Political and economical causes will conspire to bring about the extinction of slavery within not many years, and this once gone, the only possible inducement for Southern independence will have vanished. The animosity which now fires the Southern people against their Northern brethren will have burnt itself out; the leaders of the Rebellion will have gone to their rest, and the free South will come back to the free North, and find her true political, commercial, and industrial interests all enhanced by the Union.

God only knows which of these results, or if some other, will follow the war. But one thing is very evident, viz., that the longer the contest lasts, within certain limits, the more surely will freedom come to the slave. The war, and this alone, has already freed some hundred thousands, and has brought liberty within the sure fruition of thousands more by State legislation, now pending. And even in the event of complete Southern success, if peace be postponed a year or two, the continuance of the war will, by preventing the production of cotton in the Southern States, and by insuring a supply, or an increasing yield, of cotton from other countries, deprive the South of the only advantage which she hoped to gain by the Rebellion. For the monopoly of cotton will be lost to the South, and this removed, slavery must cease to be a remunerative system of labour, and abolition must necessarily ensue.

Thus, in any event, good will be evolved from all this trial. But the greatest amount of good with the least attendant evil will come if the Federal Government triumph. And this is the result which England should desire.

This war has been characterized by many sensible persons as being most unnecessary and objectless, even on the part of the Federal Government. Strictly speaking, all wars are unnecessary, and none more so than was the late Crimean war, even on the part of the Western Powers, according to the arguments of the latest historian of that conflict, Mr. Kinglake. If rulers and people were always governed by principles of wisdom and justice in their international relations, there need be no wars. Certainly, no war could have been more unwise and unnecessary than the present struggle in America, on the part of the South; and it must be remembered by those who in England criticise the Free States so sharply, that it was literally forced by the South upon the reluctant Government of the Union, and the loyal people. If the South had been desirous, at any time within the last thirty years, to inaugurate a system of gradual emancipation, with pecuniary aid from the general Treasury, she could have accomplished this object with the full and hearty concurrence of the Free States. Within this period the United States'

Treasury has been overflowing with a surplus of, more or less, \$50,000,000, which would have been well and nobly expended upon such a measure. But, so far from desiring anything of this kind, the South, as we have seen, obstinately refused, year after year, to allow even a petition to be presented to Congress looking to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia alone.

And now, as to the probable duration of the war, who can fix it? Two things are very certain with regard to the contest, viz., that slavery was the cause of it, and that no termination of it ought to be considered as satisfactory (either to the United States, or to those who have made such long and loud professions of abhorrence of slavery as the English Government and people,) which does not involve the certain overthrow of this institution. And another fact equally certain is, that the war has not yet continued long enough to ensure this "consummation devoutly to be wished for;" for the South has not yet lost her hold upon Texas and the Slave States to the west of the Mississippi—territories in themselves large enough to constitute an empire, and, in connexion with the Slave States to the east of the river, extensive enough, and sufficiently abounding in all natural resources, to ensure to the Confederacy, humanly speaking, a durable existence and a portentously bright career as a *slave power*.

It was natural enough that, considering the much greater resources of all kinds at the command of the Federal Government than those which the South seemed to possess, the people of the Free States and the world in general should have anticipated a speedy triumph of the North; and, under a Government and people possessed of a military organization, and accustomed to warlike operations, such an event might, perhaps, have been accomplished. But the more one reflects upon the matter, the more convinced must one be that a *speedy* end of the war, and a *satisfactory* ending of it, were entirely incompatible with each other. For, *first*, if slavery has been the cause of the disunion which has gradually been growing up between the two sections of the country almost ever since the Union became constituted, and finally of the actual contest, it is evident that we can have no re-union nor any permanent peace out of Union, until slavery shall be abolished all over the land, or, at least, placed in a fair way of being abolished, or until the present pretensions and claims of the Southern Confederacy shall have been very materially circumscribed. No reflecting person can believe that any other influence than a continuation of the present war can accomplish any of these results. Even the complete submission of the South (of which, happily, there is no prospect!) to-day, while slavery still retains a considerable portion of its old *prestige* as a means to political power, and as a profitable system of labour, would be no solution of the question. On the contrary, the

latter would only be rendered more difficult than ever; the evil spirit would re-possess the body politic, bringing with it seven other complications more terrible than the original, to be cast out, if cast out at all, only after convulsions sevenfold more dreadful than the present. In God's name, then, let us fight out the question now.

*Secondly*, though there be an immense moral principle involved in this question of slavery, there is also a weighty, economic, and material element in it; and the slaveholders are so thoroughly and, probably, so honestly convinced of the morality of the system, that the only mode left of converting them to just views is to destroy the *profitableness* of slavery. To undermine in their hearts their idolatry towards their "peculiar institution," their peculiar crop must be for a time uprooted; in other words, to overthrow slavery, remove from the South the cotton monopoly which has given to slavery its political power, and its value as a labour system. This might have been accomplished at any time since the cultivation of cotton became so closely interwoven with American slavery, if a general anti-slave cotton league could have been instituted in Europe and in the Free States of America. But there were not wisdom, foresight, and self-sacrifice enough in the world for that, and now nothing but the continuance of this war, which the wickedness and wilfulness of the South began, can bring about this result, and this will accomplish it surely and thoroughly. The Almighty makes the wrath of man to praise Him. "The mill of God grinds slow, but *very* fine;" and since He has taken the settlement of the slavery question into His own hand, we may be sure that it will be thoroughly sifted and well disposed of in the end. The North has met with reverses, but, according to the testimony of the Southerners themselves, she has been steadily gaining ground, and, thus far, has been driven from no important position which she has won since the war began. We may hope, therefore, that the Free States will continue to progress slowly but steadily, until, if the Confederacy become independent at all, it will be within such limits as to be dangerous only to itself.

Thus, though war be a terrible mode of settling this question, it is manifestly the only one; but, dreadful as it is to all parties immediately concerned in it, and to those who from a distance look out upon the struggle, it is not difficult to see how it will, in the end, bring ample compensation to all. The *South* will, eventually, if slavery be overthrown, find the value of her lands increased an hundredfold; she will find the character of her population improved in proportion; she will find free-labour cheaper and more profitable, and, beyond comparison, more available for all those complicated forms of industry which characterize the present day, and which are essential to real national progress; and, more than this, she will

find that the blight and bane which, as we have seen, Southerners themselves admit had settled down upon their country and their people, will have been lifted off and removed. As to *the Free States*, not only will the enormous material expenditure which they have made be repaid to them, good measure, pressed down, and running over, but the blood of their children, slain in this most just and righteous cause, will rise up to the throne of God, like martyrs' prayers, and be recompensed in blessings. The reapers will return from these fields of slaughter, bearing with them to their peaceful homes sheaves of glory far more noble and lasting than the wreaths of ordinary conquerors; the curse, which has been concealed amidst all the material prosperity so long and lavishly showered down upon their country, will have been expiated and withdrawn; and her sons, chastened by suffering, will become wiser and better citizens of a more glorious Republic.

I maintain, too, that it is for the real interest of *England* (and of Europe) that this war, which she has done nothing to occasion, and which she cannot arrest without infinite mischief to herself, shall continue until the slave monopoly of cotton shall have ceased. Dependence upon any single source of supply for a staple of such immense importance is evidently contrary to the interest of any country, especially a foreign country; and above all, dependence upon a supply which, by the exigencies or political ambition or animosity of the owners of three millions of slaves, may be, at any moment, cut off. Freedom from such a dependence as this will be a lasting gain and a real blessing to England, not an illusory promise, such as *Free Trade* with an independent Southern Confederacy would be, or a *political alliance* such as was advocated by the noble mover of Recognition in the House of Lords, not only illusory, but disgraceful.

And as to *the slaves*, what will become of them, if freed? They will remain where "*the ignoble love of gold*" of their former masters had placed them; but they will remain to reap a fair recompense for their toil, and, by their social improvement and more cheerful and more productive industry, to assist in bringing prosperity upon the land which, hitherto, by a just retribution, they had cursed. The assertion, probably honestly made and really believed in by the Southerners, that the whites and freed slaves will not be able to dwell in the same land, will, by the very necessities of the case, be disproved. For by whom is the land to be cultivated? The poor non-slave-holding whites, accustomed hitherto to regard labour of every kind, and especially field-labour, as degrading, and rendered still more averse to it by the military life which they will have recently led, will not for years acquire more just views and more industrious habits. Hence the freed slaves will be the only available labourers, and the planters will perforce employ them; they

will have been accustomed to agricultural labours, and by their natural docility, and their acquired habits of obedience and respect towards the planters, they will be the most agreeable labourers whom the latter could possibly procure. It has already been abundantly proven, on most or all of the well-managed plantations, that the most effectual method to ensure diligence and fidelity of work from the negroes, *while slaves*, was to stimulate them by the prospect of rewards. It was even true that, after the plantation tasks had been fulfilled, even at the close of a long day of unrequited toil, the slaves would generally labour far into the night upon their own little plots of ground, to raise small products which they could call and dispose of as their own. Since this war began, too, the freed slaves have been constantly found to work industriously and cheerfully with the prospect of recompense for their labour. It does not admit of doubt, therefore, that the negroes, when freed, will do the work of the plantations, or any other of which they are, or may become, capable, with any less alacrity or profit than when they were slaves. On the contrary, if well treated, it is almost certain that the new régime of freedom will prove far more profitable to the planters, and incomparably more beneficial in every way to the labourers, than the old despotism of slavery. Fortunately, too, the planters will be obliged, in self-defence, to exercise a supervision over the negroes, as to conduct, habits of industry, the mode of spending their wages, &c. ; as, otherwise, the services of the only labourers whom they can procure will fail them. The law of supply and demand will assert its supremacy at the South as elsewhere ; if some negroes will not work, others will ; and thus, those who will not, will find themselves superseded. The common instincts of humanity are as strong in the black as in the white, and necessity and good example will beget habits of industry and thrift. The labourer, finding himself necessary to the employer, will learn also that he has *rights* which the latter must respect and acknowledge ; and so, gradually, the condition of the negro race at the South will improve, and the negro will come to be regarded and treated as a fellow-man ; and possibly the injunction of St. Paul will become obeyed heartily and from conviction of self-interest, as well as from higher motives, so that the negro will be looked upon by his former master "*no longer as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved.*"

There will be another element, also, in the improved labour-system of the South which must not be lost sight of, although it need not be more than alluded to here, viz, the immigration of white labourers from the Free States and from Europe, attracted, as they will be, by the demand for labour, the comparative mildness of the climate, &c. And not only will white labourers gradually find their way thither, but persons possessed of means to purchase land will wend their steps to "the sunny South," from which they

have hitherto been excluded by the institution of slavery, and so the whole social condition of that, naturally, most favoured land will be immeasurably improved and elevated, and the Southern States will at last become really prosperous.

An eloquent French writer, in picturing to himself the progress of the South, were slavery removed, says (and the reader will not fail to note how precisely the passage agrees with that already quoted from the *Times*)—"It would be difficult to find, in any part of the world, societies morally superior to those of the New England States. Their inhabitants possess a just appreciation of their liberty and dignity; instruction is general; the spirit of invention is active to an extraordinary degree; love of the arts is becoming more and more developed; every commendable enterprise is prosecuted with unexampled liberality, and progress in everything is the universal aim. *And what Liberty has accomplished here, it will effect elsewhere over all the vast Anglo-Saxon Republic, when the land shall have been purged of the crime of slavery, and when the slave, freed from his chain, shall grasp as a friend the hand of his former master.*"—(*Revue des deux Mondes*, January, 1861.)

## APPENDIX.

---

The following facts, concerning the manner in which the United States' Government and people have enforced their own neutrality in favour of Great Britain, are taken from a Pamphlet recently published by Mr. Lowrey, of New York :—

### EARLY NEUTRALITY OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

America had scarcely taken upon herself the habitudes of a nation before she was called to perform her international obligations of neutrality. The circumstances involved great embarrassment. One belligerent was our friend, benefactor, and sister republic, France ; the other was our enemy and late tyrant, England. We were weak, and but poorly prepared to resist the importunities of our friend, to whom we owed so large a debt of gratitude. We were also entangled by treaty stipulations with her, under which she enjoyed certain privileges in our waters to the exclusion of England ; and this again, together with a strong public sympathy for her, caused President Washington and his advisers great difficulty in securing in favour of England an impartial observance of neutrality in the matters not touched by the treaty.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, President Washington, in the inaugural speech of his second term, proceeded to declare a strict rule of neutrality, under the law of nations, which has been faithfully observed to this day. (Speech to Congress, American State Papers, Foreign Relations, vol. 1, p. 21.) On the 22nd of April, 1793, he issued his proclamation, containing these words :—

*"I have given instructions to those officers to whom it belongs to cause prosecutions to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the Courts of the United States, violate the law of nations [we had no statute at that time] with respect to the powers at war, or any of them."*—(*Ibid*, 140.)

This was followed by written instructions from Alexander Hamil-

ton, Secretary of the Treasury, to the Collectors of the Customs, requiring "the greatest vigilance, care, activity, and impartiality" in searching for and discovering any attempt to fit out vessels and expeditions, or send men, to the aid of either party (*ibid*, 140); and so strict were these requirements, that Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, the great champion of France, felt compelled to denounce them as "setting up a system of espionage destructive to the peace of society."—(Jefferson's Works, vol. 9, 556; 3 *ib.*, 556.) While Mr. Jefferson declared in Cabinet Council (9 Jeff. W., 154), "It is inconsistent for a nation which has been patiently bearing for ten years the grossest insults and injuries from their late enemies, to rise at a feather against their friends and benefactors; and at a moment, too, when circumstances have kindled the most ardent affections of the two people towards each other," he still wrote to the French representative, M. Ternant, demanding the cessation of the fitting out of certain privateers in Charleston (3 Jeff., 561); and to his successor, Citizen Genet (whom we afterwards sent home for endeavouring to make use of our harbours for such illegal purposes), "The fitting out of armed vessels against nations with whom we are at peace is instrumental to the annoyance of those nations, and thereby tends to compromit the peace, and it is the duty of a neutral nation to prohibit such acts as would injure either of the warring parties."—(*Ibid*, 571.)

One of the first cases demanding action by the Government was that of the "Little Sarah." Upon the suggestion by Mr. Hammond, the British representative, that she was to be fitted as a French privateer, she was seized, and, being found to contain a suspicious armament, was prevented from sailing. About the same time the British ship "Grange" was taken in American waters by the French war vessel "l'Embuscade." The act was considered a breach of our sovereignty, and the prize seized and restored to her British owners. Numerous prizes were, on proof that the capturing vessels had been fitted out in the United States, restored to their owners. The Government did not wait for action by the British representative, but held its own officers to the duty of vigilance. The Governors of the States were frequently called upon to arrest vessels about departing.—(Hamilton's W., vol. 2, 463.) In one case we find this language used:—

"The case in question is that of a vessel armed, equipped, and manned, in a port of the United States, for the purpose of committing hostilities on a nation at peace with us.

"As soon as it was perceived that such enterprises would be attempted, orders to prevent them were despatched to all the States and ports of the Union. In consequence of these, the Governor of New York, receiving information that a sloop heretofore called the 'Folly,' now the 'Republican,' was fitting, arming, and manning, to cruise against a nation with whom we were at peace, seized the vessel."

The President, being apprized, ordered her and the persons engaged to be delivered over to the tribunals for punishment.—(3 Jeff. W., 386.) Such seizures were frequently made, the Government entering



into it as a matter of honour, not appearing to suppose that its duty would be performed by sitting coldly by until the British Minister, under all the embarrassments of being a stranger, should produce irrefragable proof of infractions of its own laws. General Washington seems to have considered it a shameful and humiliating excuse for a Government to plead that it "is ignorant of what is carried on daily and repeatedly in its own country." It was impossible, however, with our limited navy, to prevent entirely such expeditions, and at last, at the risk of a war with our friend, it was resolved in Cabinet Council, on the 15th of August, 1793, "That the Minister of the French Republic be informed that the President considers the United States as bound by positive assurances, given in conformity to the laws of neutrality, to effectuate the restoration of, or make compensation for, prizes which shall have been made from any of the parties at war with France, subsequent to the 5th day of June last, by privateers fitted out in our ports. That it is consequently expected that he will cause restitution to be made of all prizes taken and brought into our ports subsequent to the above-mentioned day by such privateers; in default of which the *President considers it incumbent upon the United States to indemnify the owners of those prizes*; the indemnification to be reimbursed by the French nation."—(4 Hamilton's Works, 468.) At the same time Mr. Jefferson's important letter to Mr. Hammond was written.

The basis of this voluntary action of our Government was that sound maxim of the law of nations, that a State is *prima facie* responsible for whatever is done within its jurisdiction, since it must be presumed to be capable of preventing or punishing offences committed within its boundaries; and that a body politic is, therefore, responsible for those acts of individuals which are acts of real or meditated hostility towards a nation with which the Government of these subjects professes to maintain relations of friendship or neutrality.—(3 Phillimore's International Law, 218; Grotius, l. ii., c. 21, § 2; Puffendorff, l. i., c. 5, § ult.) In the year following, upon the application of England, and for her better protection—(Canning's Speeches, vol. 4, pp. 152, 153. Abr. Debates in Congress, vol. 7)—we passed the Act of 1794; and lastly, *and most important to be remembered* when the day of settlement comes, we, in that year, entered into a treaty of amity and commerce with her, by which, *on her demand, we undertook to pay to her and her citizens all losses suffered by armed vessels fitted out in our ports.*

Our conduct during this whole period received, and still receives, the commendation of all enlightened publicists. Phillimore and Ward are profuse in their praise of the justice, dignity, and intelligence which marked the action of our Government; and Mr. Canning lost no opportunity in Parliament to urge an emulation of our example. In the debates upon Lord Althorp's petition for the repeal of the Foreign Enlistment Act—(Hansard's Parl. Debates N. S., vol. 8, p. 1,019-59, Canning's Speeches, vol. 4, pp. 152, 153)—he said:—

"It surely could not be forgotten that in 1794 this country complained of various breaches of neutrality (though much inferior to those now under consideration) committed on the part of subjects of the United States. What was the conduct of that nation in consequence? Did it resent the complaint as an infringement of its independence? *Did it refuse to take such steps as would insure the immediate observance of neutrality?* Neither. In 1794, immediately after the application from the British Government, the Legislature of the United States passed an Act prohibiting, under heavy penalties, the engagement of American citizens in the armies of any foreign powers. Was that the only instance of the kind? It was but last year (1818) that the United States passed an Act, by which the Act of 1794 was confirmed in every respect, again prohibiting the engagement of their citizens in the service of any foreign powers; and pointing distinctly to the service of Spain or the South American provinces."

He might have added, had he spoken at a later period, that in 1838 we again, upon the request of Great Britain, called in legislative aid; this time to prevent succour to the Canadian rebellion. Again, in 1823, he said (Canning's Speeches, vol. 5, pp. 50, 51):—

"If I wished for a guide in a system of neutrality, I would take that laid down by America in the days of the Presidency of Washington and the secretaryship of Jefferson. Here, sir," he added, after stating what we had done, "I contend, is the principle on which we ought to act."

After the treaty of 1794, the efforts of our Government to prevent infractions of its neutrality were still increased.

In 1803 (President's Message, October 17th), Mr. Jefferson said:—

"We have seen, with sincere concern, the flames of war lighted up again in Europe, and nations, with which we have the most friendly and useful relations, engaged in mutual destruction. \* \* \* In the course of this conflict, let it be our endeavour, as it is our interest, to cultivate the friendship of the belligerent nations *by every act of justice and innocent kindness*; to receive their armed vessels with hospitality from the distresses of the sea; but to administer the means of annoyance to none; to establish in our harbours such a police as may maintain law and order; to restrain our citizens from embarking individually in a war in which their country has no part, *and to punish severely those persons, citizen or alien, who usurp our flag not entitled to it.*" \*

In 1805 still greater vigour was announced. Mr. Jefferson, in the annual Message of that year, says, after reciting certain infractions of our neutrality and sovereignty:—

"These enormities appearing to be unreachd by any control of their sovereigns, I found it necessary to equip a force, to cruise

\* It is well known that the "Alabama" usually approaches her victims under the English flag. See papers in the matter of the "Brilliant," published by the New York Chamber of Commerce, 1862.

within our own seas, to arrest all vessels of this description found hovering on our coasts within the limits of the Gulf Stream, and to bring in the offenders *for trial as pirates*."—(Am. State Pap. For. Rel., vol. 1, p. 66.)

In 1817, Spain was engaged in a contest with her colonies. The proximity of the scene of conflict, the sympathy which our people naturally held with the struggling colonies, and the adventurous character of our seamen, all combined to make interference feasible and attractive. Many attempts were made, the better to prevent which, we passed the Act of 1818, alluded to by Mr. Canning. A voluminous correspondence took place between Don Luis de Onís, the Spanish Minister, and the State Department, touching these armaments, a critical examination of which will show that the charges now constantly made by the English press, that our Government was derelict at that time, are not well founded. Some vessels escaped, perhaps, in spite of our vigilance. One case, which occurred in Baltimore, has been related by a gentleman who was cognizant of the fact. A suspected vessel had been seized, and, to prevent her going to sea before the matter could be investigated, her sails were taken from her and packed in a warehouse. After a time, the Captain, who persistingly asserted his innocence, asked permission to take the sails to spread them for drying, they being in danger of mildew. The port officer, a confiding and not over-shrewd person, consented, and in the night the vessel slipped away, leaving the simple official to make the best settlement with his Government that he could. Upon the final adjustment of the respective claims between Spain and the United States, it was not denied by us that we were liable to make compensation to sufferers by armed vessels, which we might have stopped; but, on the contrary, we took from Spain a release from all claims of this character, as part of the consideration for the concessions which we then made.—(Treaty with Spain, 1819.) And on December 7th, 1819, President Monroe declared to the world (annual Message), referring to Spanish matters:—

"It is gratifying to have it in my power to state, so strong has been the sense throughout the whole community of what is due to the character and obligations of the nation, that very few examples of a contrary kind have occurred."

In 1838 our Government was again zealous in the enforcement of what had by this time become its traditional policy, and used its most vigorous efforts in endeavouring to prevent all interference by our people in the disturbances then existing in Canada. In an official letter, Mr. Webster says:—

"The President directs me to say that it is his fixed resolution that all such disturbers of the public peace and violaters of the laws of their country shall be brought to *exemplary punishment*."—(Webster's Works, vol. 6, p. 260.)

In the same volume Mr. Webster refers to the fixed American doctrine on this subject, especially the practice of directing our officers to watch for infringements of neutrality, without waiting for

information, and cites the instructions given to our army during the war for Texan independence.—(*Ibid*, p. 452.)

In the case of the bark "Maury," which vessel was seized at New York in 1855, on suspicion of being a Russian privateer, our Government made a careful investigation, and only discharged her after the production of evidence that she was bound upon a legitimate voyage to China. In the case of the Russian frigate "Grand Admiral," work was wholly suspended until the close of the Crimean war, and the ship did not sail from New York until 1859, three years after the declaration of peace. Numerous other cases of similar character are cited in this pamphlet, establishing the fairness and consistency of the American doctrine of neutrality.

I cannot do better than quote the concluding paragraphs of the recent speech of Mr. Cobden, from the *Times* of 25th of April. Speaking of the conduct of the prominent political men in Congress during the Canadian Rebellion, Mr. Cobden says:—

"Now, let us pause for a moment to do homage to those leading politicians who, at a time of immense excitement and great animosity, brought their great influence to bear (hear), and threw their momentary popularity to the wind, that they might, as every man of public influence ought to do, exercise that influence for the advantage of their country. (Hear, hear.) Now, I am going to put an hypothetical case. Let us suppose that, instead of the treatment which we received from the American Government, the President had replied to Mr. Fox in these terms:—

"I hope the people and Government of the United Kingdom will believe that we are doing our best in every case to execute the law; but they must not imagine that any cry which may be raised will induce us to come down to Congress with a proposal to alter the law. If this cry is raised for the purpose of driving the President's Government to do something which may be contrary to the dignity of the country in the way of altering our laws for the purpose of pleasing another Government, then all I can say is, that such a course is not likely to accomplish its purpose."

"That, with the simple alteration of 'United States' for 'United Kingdom,' 'this House' for 'Congress,' 'Her Majesty's Government' for 'the President's Government,' that is the speech of the noble Lord at the head of the Government three weeks ago. (Hear, hear.) Let me now draw your attention to what was done in consequence of that promise of the American Government. Notwithstanding that the American Foreign Enlistment Act, as it stood, was much more stringent than ours,—gave the Government greater powers than ours now does,—they passed a supplementary Act conferring upon the Government such authority that one could hardly believe that such arbitrary powers could have been given. (Ironical cheers.) There is a 'hear, hear,' of rather a doubtful tone, but let hon. gentlemen remember that this happened some twenty-five years ago, and nobody

then said that the Americans were fond of submitting to tyranny. (Hear, hear.) By this temporary Act, which received the assent of the President on the 10th of March, 1838, it is enacted that—

“ ‘The several collectors, naval officers, surveyors and inspectors of customs, the marshals and deputy marshals of the United States, and every other officer who may be specially empowered for the purpose by the President of the United States, are hereby respectively authorized and required to seize and detain any vessel which may be provided and prepared for any military expedition or enterprize against the territory or dominion of any foreign Prince,’ and so on.

“ ‘It gives them power to seize a vessel without any proof on oath, an absolute power of seizure on suspicion, and a right to detain the vessel during ten days, during which they shall be able to give evidence on oath before a judge; and in case they fail, the ship is to be released, but is to be liable to be seized again in case any cause should arise. And to carry out this arbitrary temporary Act, the whole power of the militia and the volunteers of the country was placed at the disposal of these officers. That is the third instance in which the Americans have legislated for the benefit of European States. There is a fourth instance in which they were appealed to. At the outbreak of the Crimean war we sent a communication to the American Government, and a duplicate was sent from France, expressing the hope that the American Government would—

“ ‘In the spirit of just reciprocity, give orders that no privateer under Russian colours shall be equipped, or victualled, or admitted with its prizes in the ports of the United States; and also that the citizens of the United States shall rigorously abstain from taking part in armaments of this nature, or in any other measure opposed to the duties of a strict neutrality.’

“ ‘I will not go over what has been so often referred to—the action of the American Government with reference to that ship which was about half built for the Russian Government. The building of that vessel was suspended,—I have heard some people say that it was suspended because the Russian Government could not find money for the completion of the ship; but does anybody believe that, when the Russian Government was spending millions a-week at Sebastopol? That vessel was not finished until three years after the war was concluded. There was another vessel called the ‘Maury,’ which was suspected of being intended for the Russian Government, and was stopped under circumstances which showed a great deal more activity and vigilance than we have exhibited in the case of the ‘Alabama. But I will not refer further to these matters. What I want to deduce from all these facts is, first, that the American Government has from the very foundation of their State shown a willingness to maintain and enforce a strict neutrality in the wars which have been constantly taking place between European States; and next, that they have done it under circumstances of the utmost difficulty. It is easy enough to maintain neutrality where you have no feelings either way, but they did it in spite of their sympathies and in opposi-

tion to their wishes. There can be no doubt that, in the case of the Canadian rebellion, there was a strong feeling among the mass of the American people that a successful rebellion in Canada might have led to a friendly annexation with the United States. There is no doubt that the strongest national yearnings were mixed up with the matter; and I want to call the attention of the House to the fact, that, in spite of these temptations to go wrong, the United States have uniformly gone right on this question. We may have had other grounds of complaint. I think that in regard to our enlistments in America they persisted in their resentment against us in a manner that partook of unfriendly severity, if not of direct hostility (hear); but in the matter of their Foreign Enlistment Acts, I repeat again, and let no one answer me with a vague statement of what he has heard somewhere or other—I challenge any one to show me in all our diplomatic correspondence a despatch which complains of an unredressed grievance under those Acts. I have mentioned these circumstances in the hope that they may become generally known, and in order that they may bring the sentiments of this House and the public opinion of this country to a temper which shall incline us to act by the United States as they have acted by us. (Hear, hear.) If the motives which I have appealed to in this statement of facts will not have that effect, then I do not know that I ought to spend another minute in trying to bring any other motives to bear upon the minds of my countrymen. I do not intend to appeal to your fears; that would be out of the question; but I will not sit down without saying a word or two with reference to the interest we have in the question. If gratitude for the past observance of an honourable neutrality is not sufficient, let us look at what will be the consequence of pursuing another course. The hon. and learned gentleman the Solicitor-General, in a speech from which I may not quote, as it was delivered in a previous debate this Session, but which he has published as a pamphlet, laid it down that we have only to deal with municipal law, and that the Foreign Enlistment Act was passed at our own will and pleasure, and that we may repeal it in like manner at our own pleasure. The Solicitor-General laid it down broadly that the Foreign Enlistment Act was simply a measure of municipal law, which we might repeal at our own will and pleasure. Now, I join issue with the hon. and learned gentleman, and I say we are bound as distinctly to the United States by the rules of honourable reciprocity in this case as if treaty engagements existed. We have gone to the Americans begging them not to allow their citizens to molest us ('no, no!') begging them not to allow privateers to be fitted out; and when it is clear that there has been no violation of their law, we are, I contend, bound to observe the same honourable neutrality. The hon. and learned gentleman says that if we choose to allow both parties to come and buy ships of war here, no infringement of our neutral position would, as a consequence, take place. That may be an abstract legal truth; but what must we say of a statesman who stands up in the House of Commons and gives expression to such a *dictum* as that, to

be quoted hereafter in Washington? I am not going to discuss points of law with the hon. and learned gentleman; that would be an act of presumption on my part, and we may possibly observe neutrality either by abstaining from assisting either party in the contest or by rendering assistance to both. Is that, however, let me ask, a state of things which we ought to covet? I should like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite what would be our fate in any of those numerous wars in which we have been engaged, and to the recurrence of which we are liable, if this doctrine were carried fully into effect? If, for instance, the little dark cloud which threatened a rupture with Brazil had burst upon our heads, America would, according to the theory of the hon. and learned gentleman, be entitled not only to build ships for us, but might fit out vessels for the Brazilian Government, to cruise in the name of that Government and with the commission of the Brazilian Emperor, against our commerce. But I will not rest my argument merely on the ground that this is a thing which might possibly happen if we were to adopt the line of policy to which the hon. and learned gentleman has, as I think, so unwisely referred. Can we, I would ask, look for the maintenance of the law relative to foreign enlistment in America, or elsewhere, unless we ourselves set the example of good faith? You have not only in America, but in France, a most stringent law on this subject. I wrote to a friend in France to ascertain what was the mode of proceeding adopted there in order to prevent vessels slipping from their ports as the 'Alabama' had done from ours, and I was told that they required no Foreign Enlistment Act there for the purpose. ('Hear, hear,' and a laugh.) By a penal code—which I believe all the nations of the Continent imitate, more or less—any citizen of France who, without the consent of the Government, commits an act of hostility against a foreign Power by which the country incurs the risk of war, is liable to transportation. (Hear, hear.) The law further provides that anybody who fits out a ship of war, or does any hostile act owing to which an enemy inflicts reprisals on a French citizen, will likewise be held subject to the same penalty. This, you may say, is very severe; but then you want reciprocity with that country. The French do not ask you to pass a law in accordance with their model; but what both France and America will require is this, that you will in the event of war, as far as lies in your power, prevent privateers from going out and preying upon their commerce. You may choose any way you please to do it; but surely you have too much common sense to imagine that you can induce America to abstain from such a system in the future unless you observe the laws of a fair reciprocity in her regard. Now, is there, let me ask, no way in which you can prevent ships of war from sailing from your ports, threatening, as they do, the commerce of a friendly country, all of them built in England, manned from England, armed and equipped from England, roaming the seas without any fixed goal, and marking their track by fire and devastation? That is the question to which you have to address yourselves, and unless you are prepared to set your face against this system, the Foreign Enlistment Act will be, as the hon. and

learned member for Plymouth said, a dead letter; and if it be made a dead letter here, most assuredly the same state of things will result elsewhere. Who, then, I should like to know, has the most to lose by the adoption of this system? How many of the ships which float upon the salt water belong to British capitalists? The lowest estimate I have heard formed of the number of these vessels, as entered through the insurance-offices in the City and other quarters, shows that we have upon an average from £100,000,000 to £120,000,000 sterling worth of the property of British capitalists on the seas. Rest assured, no other country has £30,000,000 worth, and that you have as much property at stake upon the ocean as all the rest of the world put together. You have, moreover, 10,000,000 people in the year to feed upon food brought from foreign countries. You get three-fourths of the tea and four-fifths of the silk from China; more than one-half of the tallow and hemp from Russia; there is more cotton, more wheat, more Indian corn brought to us than to any other country. You are so powerful here in your island home, that you can set the world at defiance; but the moment you begin a war of reprisals, your commerce is the most vulnerable of any. ('No, no!') Hon. gentlemen who deny the truth of that statement do not understand the position of the commerce of England. But, be that as it may, is there, I would ask, anything which we can do to show our good faith in this matter? Is it not strange that we should have any one in this country, and especially in this House, claiming to be a reflective man, who would a moment consent to put himself alongside of those who are committing such acts as those to which I have alluded, against the laws as well as the vital interests of the nation? I wish to see the public ranged on the side of law in this case as well as in every other. Every one engaged in building a ship of war in violation of the law is committing an offence subjecting him to the penal consequences of fine and imprisonment. Is there nobody so engaged? If so, is there nothing we can do to show that we wish to put down this system? The case of the 'Alabama' is, perhaps, clearer than that of the 'Florida' or the 'Japan.' The last-mentioned vessel was, however, one not only built here for the Confederate Government, but manned by Englishmen surreptitiously conveyed on board the ship. In the case of the 'Alabama,' Earl Russell said that she escaped from our ports on the pretext of going on a trip of pleasure. In another despatch he states that he sent out orders to have this vessel stopped at Nassau. But if she was to be stopped at Nassau, why not elsewhere? (Hear, hear.) It is said you cannot stop a vessel like that after the first voyage. My answer to the objection is, that the 'Alabama' has never made a voyage at all. She has been cruising about, and never has had a home. But why, let me ask, did not the Government forbid the entry of this vessel into your own ports, known as she is to have left this country, and to be manned by English sailors, in violation of the Foreign Enlistment Act? Would anybody have a right to complain of your taking that course? Issue a proclama-



tion to the effect that this vessel stole away from your ports, and that, so far as those ports go, she is outlawed. If you were to do that, and other countries were to follow your example, you would soon put an end to such proceedings by making them unprofitable. The whole system of the Foreign Enlistment Act is, I may add, only 200 years old. The ancients did not know the meaning of the word 'neutrality' as we know it at the present day. In the Middle Ages people were hardly aware of such a thing as neutrality. A better state of things has gradually grown up; and shall we, I would ask, by repealing the Foreign Enlistment Act, be the first to go back to the barbarism of the Middle Ages? I cannot help thinking that this House, when it reflects on the facts of the case, will refuse to give its sanction to a retrograde policy which would be unworthy of this country, and a great crime against humanity. (Cheers.)"

APR 20 1891  
MAY 4 1891

NOV 18 1892









3 2044 018 731 521

**THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED  
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS  
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON  
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED  
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE  
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE  
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.**



